University of Alberta

A Comparative Analysis of *Topoi*, Genre, and the Formation of Historical Narratives in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean with a Focus on the Book of Chronicles

by

Timothy Langille ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Religious Studies

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring 2007

Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-29887-9
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-29887-9

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

This thesis examines genres of history and the formation of historical discourses in ancient Israel, Mesopotamia, and Greece. After discussing the didactic nature of historical narratives, the formation of historical narratives, and genre negotiations in the ancient Near East and Mediterranean, this thesis cross-culturally compares and analyzes *topoi*, narrative structures, and narrative patterns from the Book of Chronicles with Mesopotamian historical discourses, Herodotus' *Histories*, and Xenophon's *Hellenica*.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: The Past as a Mirror: History as a Didactic Narrative 19
1.1 Past as a Mirror: A Cross-Cultural Phenomenon 19
1.2 History, Narrative, and Didacticism 21
1.3 Genre: History and Fiction 35
1.4 Definitions of History in the Hebrew Bible 47

Chapter 2: Narrative, Didacticism, and Divine Providence in Chronicles, Mesopotamian Historiography, and Greek Historiography 52
2.1 Chronicles 52
2.1.1 Narrative and Didacticism 52
2.1.2 Divine Providence 56
2.1.3 Summary 61
2.2 Babylonian Historical Narratives 61
2.2.1 Narrative and Didacticism 61
2.2.2 Divine Providence 63
A. The Weidner Chronicle, Chronicle of Early Kings, and Chronicle P 65
B. Adad-Shumur-UsurEpic and Nabopolassar Epic 68
2.2.2 Summary 71
2.3 The *Histories* 72
2.3.1 Narrative and Didacticism 72
2.3.2 Divine Providence 75
2.3.3 Summary 82
2.4 The *Hellenica* 83
2.4.1 Narrative and Didacticism 83
2.4.2 Divine Providence 85
2.4.3 Summary 88
2.5 Analysis 88

Chapter 3: Paradigmatic Individuals 91
3.1 Chronicles 92
3.2 The Weidner Chronicle 98
3.3 The *Histories* 101
3.4 The *Hellenica* 105
3.5 Analysis 108

Chapter 4: Central City and Legitimate Cultic Space in Chronicles and Babylonian Historical Narratives 111
4.1 Persian Yehud and Samaria 112
4.2 Jerusalem and its Cult in Chronicles 114
4.3 Babylon and its Cult in Babylonian Historical Narratives 119
4.4 Analysis 121

Chapter 5: Restorer of Order in Ancient Near Eastern Historical Discourses **123**
5.1 Hezekiah in Chronicles 124
5.2 Cyrus in Chronicles 126
5.3 The Cyrus Cylinder and Verse Account of Nabonidus 129
5.4 The Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon 130
5.5 Analysis 132

Chapter 6: Explaining Disaster: Immediate and Deferred Retribution in Chronicles, the *Histories*, and the *Hellenica* **138**
6.1 The Case for Immediate Retribution in Chronicles 138
6.2 Arguments against Universal Individual and Immediate Retribution 140
6.3 Deferred Retribution in Chronicles 144
6.4 Summary
6.5 Immediate vs. Deferred Retribution in Greek Historiography 145
6.6 The Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, the Greek Military Victory over the Persians, and the Fall of Sparta: Retribution in Central Events in Chronicles, the *Histories*, and the *Hellenica* 147
6.6.1 Chronicles' Explanations for the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple 147
6.6.2 The Defeat of Persia 155
6.6.3 The End of Spartan Hegemony 164
6.7 Analysis 170

Chapter 7: Prophetic Figures in Chronicles and Wise Advisors in the *Histories* **173**
7.1 The Roles of Prophetic Figures and Wise Advisors 173
7.2 Direct Speech in Chronicles and the *Histories* 176
7.3 Textual Examples 180
7.3.1 Amaziah and Polycrates 181
7.3.2 Uzziah and Croesus 183
7.4 Analysis 184

Conclusions **186**

Bibliography **193**

Introduction

A recipient of bad 'PR' for centuries, the Book of Chronicles today is still considered to be of peripheral importance from literary, theological, and historical perspectives. In fact, Ben Zvi states that "[Chronicles] is often characterized as being theologically or ideologically flat, and of lesser value as a historical work, not only in comparison with Greek historiography, but also, and mainly, in comparison with the deuteronomistic historiographical works."[1] It seems as though Chronicles is viewed as an inferior historiographical work because of its lack of historicity, that is, the degree of correlation between the communicator of the text[2] and its accounts of past events and the most plausible reconstruction of monarchic Judah/Israel.[3] However, it is my contention that a lack of historicity does not lessen the value of Chronicles as an instrument with which the formation of ancient historical narratives may be understood.

---

[1] Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Book of Chronicles: Another Look," 2002 Canadian Society of Biblical Studies Presidential Address, *The Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies* 62 (2002/2003), 5.

[2] Although it is common convention to refer to the implied author of Chronicles as "the Chronicler" (for a brief discussion on "implied author", see Wayne C. Booth, "Types of Narration," in S. Onega and J.A. García Landa [eds.], *Narratology: An Introduction* [New York: Longman, 1996], 147), I choose not use this term in order to be consistent with how I treat other ancient Near Eastern discourses; that is, I do not use terms like the "Weidner Chronicler" when discussing Mesopotamian historical discourses, and therefore it seems best not use the term the Chronicler. My decision to do so is influenced by Foucault (See Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" in J.D. Faubion [ed.], *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* [Trans. R. Hurley and others; Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984; vol. 2; New York: The New York Press, 1998], 205-22). Regarding the contingency of the author function, Foucault states the following: "The author function does not affect all discourses in a universal and constant way, however. In our civilization, it has not always been the same types of texts that have required attribution to an author. There was a time when texts we today call 'literary' (narratives, stories, epics, tragedies, comedies) were accepted, put into circulation, and valorized without any question about the identity of their author; their anonymity caused no difficulties since their ancientness, whether real or imagined, was regarded as a sufficient guarantee of their status" ("What is an Author," 212). This being said, I should note that I disagree with Foucault's claim that ancientness guaranteed the status of discourses in such traditions. In the ancient Near East, discourses achieved status by being accepted by the community, regardless of their perceived ancientness. Thus, acceptance, and not ancientness, determined the status of discourses in communities with anonymous authors. In sum, I feel no need to name authors of ancient Near Eastern discourses, and therefore will leave the authors of these discourses anonymous by simply referring to them as author(s), authorship, or communicator of the text.

[3] Ben Zvi, "The Book of Chronicles," 6.

Methodological problems abound when we naturalize positivist approaches, i.e., "history as it actually happened", particularly when dealing with ancient texts. Foucault argues that "ready-made syntheses" (i.e., "those groupings that we normally accept before any examination, those links whose validity is recognized from the outset") must be challenged and ousted from their privileged position. In Foucault's words, "they must be driven out from the darkness in which they reign. And instead of according them unqualified, spontaneous value, we must accept in the name of methodological vigour, that, in the first instance, they concern only a population of dispersed events."[4] Moreover, Foucault also points out that recent categories, whether it be literature, politics, or, in this case, positivist history, are applicable only by "retrospective hypothesis" to times that preceded the advent of the construction of the category.[5] For such reasons, modern readers should be cautious of naturalizing positivist approaches to historiography. This being said, I am not suggesting abandoning such categories altogether, as I use terms like history, historiography, theology, and religion throughout this thesis. I do, however, acknowledge that when I use a term such as "religion" when discussing the ancient Near East, I am making a retrospective hypothesis, as ancient Near Eastern peoples did not distinguish between religious and secular. In sum, contemporary readers should be cautious when using such terms and concepts and not naturalize contemporary definitions and constructions of these terms and concepts.

---

[4] Michel Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith; New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 22.
[5] Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, 22.

I find it interesting how certain authors from pre-modern traditions are privileged by modern audiences because their historiographical works come closest to meeting modern positivist standards. Historians such as Thucydides, Ssu-ma Chien, Ibn Khaldun, and Kalhana have been beneficiaries of such praise, while the works of their contemporaries in their respective traditions have been undervalued because of an apparent lack of historicity. For instance, it is not uncommon to hear that Thucydides is a superior historian to Herodotus or Xenophon.[6] As a result of positivist approaches, ancient historiography such as Chronicles, Mesopotamian historical discourses, Herodotus' *Histories*, and Xenophon's *Hellenica* have been relegated as inferior historical writings because of the lack of historicity and use of divine providence for historical causation in these texts.[7] It should be noted that approaches to these texts have been changing over the last few decades, and as a result, such positivist views have been modified over time. How can we expect ancient historiography to conform to modern standards and conventions? In Foucault's words, "… historical descriptions are necessarily ordered by the present state of knowledge,"[8] a statement which leads one to conclude that it is futile, unrealistic, and methodologically flawed to expect ancient historiography to conform to modern standards.

---

[6] I recognize that some Classists are beginning to point out that the differences between Herodotus and Thucydides are not as great as once thought.

[7] The Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian Chronicle Series are an exception to the above statement. See Chronicles 1-13a in A.K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns, 2000). These chronicles are renowned for their apparent objectivity and historicity, as well as their dry and sober literary style and absence of divine providence.

[8] Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, 5.

What can modern positivist approaches reveal about genres, genre conventions, ideologies, and social institutions in certain ancient milieus? Ben Zvi states that "[a]ncient historiographical texts were not written so as to provide good sources for contemporary, critical historians of the periods described in them and therefore such considerations have no place in a discussion of ancient Israelite historical texts against *their* ancient contexts and within *their* original discourses."[9] Furthermore, Ben Zvi points out that positivist approaches are hardly helpful in "…elucidating the social functions, ideological construction and literary features of ancient writings that may be considered historical or a history."[10]

Liverani suggests that an ancient historiographical text should be read "*as a source for knowing itself*" and that scholars should focus not on the events themselves but how they are narrated.[11] Similarly, Anchor contends that "… we cannot conceive of any reality independent of the printed page…" and that "… the historian must proceed by relating the knowable (the text itself) to the, at first unknown and never completely knowable, context." With an approach focusing on the primacy of the text, the self-referentiality of language is acknowledged as language is unable to pretend to be the things for which it stands.[12] In other words, discourse theory purports that neither language nor the mind is able to act as a mirror that reflects 'reality'. "Instead, both are seen as productive activities which construct the objects that they apprehend."[13] Thus, discourse theory undermines positivist approaches to history, since language cannot pretend to be 'reality', including past events. White acknowledges this when he maintains that "… the *shape* of the *relationships* which will appear to be inherent in the objects inhabiting the field will in reality have been imposed on the field by the investigator in the very *act of identifying and describing* the objects that he finds there."[14] Furthermore, White adds that if the historian believes that he or she has found the form of the narrative in the events themselves, rather than acknowledging that the meaning of the events have been imposed, this misperception is a by-product of "… a certain lack of linguistic self-consciousness which obscures the extent to which descriptions of events *already* constitute interpretations of their nature."[15] In sum, since language is representative of itself, an analysis of the narration (and construction) of events should take precedence over an analysis of the events themselves.

---

[9] Ehud Ben Zvi, "General Observations on Ancient Israelite Histories in their Ancient Contexts," *forthcoming*.
[10] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."
[11] Mario Liverani, "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts," *Orientalia* 42 (1973), 179. Liverani's emphasis.
[12] Robert Anchor, "Narrativity and the Transformation of Historical Consciousness," *Clio* 16.2 (1987), 130.

"[Historical texts] are representations of reality insofar as the world they depict (the world of the work) claims to hold for real events in the real world."[16] According to narrative theory, "… the 'truth' of history is not to be found in a past reality conceived as objectively fixed and separate from language, but is rather created by the historian in the present in and through the story he tells."[17] When we focus on the text itself and how the events are narrated, Chronicles becomes an invaluable source for better understanding ancient historiographic conventions and the Chronicler's fourth century BCE Persian Yehud milieu.[18] Similarly, other ancient Near Eastern historical narratives and Greek historical narratives also reveal important information about ancient historiography, as well as each text's social world and its prevailing ideologies.

---

[13] Tim Murphy, "Discourse," in W. Braun and R.T. McCutcheon (eds.), *Guide to the Study of Religion* (London and New York: Cassell, 2000), 399-400.

[14] Hayden White, "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact," in *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 95.

[15] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 95.

[16] Anchor, "Narrativity," 128.

By concentrating on how events are emplotted[19] and narrated, key *topoi*,[20] including narrative patterns and paradigms, may be revealed and compared cross-culturally, since narratives appear in many forms from across all cultures. In Barthes' words, "… under this almost infinite diversity of forms, narrative is present in every age, in every place, in every society… narrative is international, transhistorical, transcultural: it is simply there, like life itself."[21] The ability to compare is significant because observations of juxtaposed texts are valuable for our understanding of general historiographical *topoi* used in certain milieus.

---

[17] Anchor, "Narrativity," 123-24.

[18] Chronicles is dated anywhere from as early as the early Persian period (sixth century) to as late as the second century BCE, and is most commonly dated to either the end of the Persian period or beginning of the Hellenistic period. Although I examine the possibility of common *topoi* in Chronicles and ancient Greek historiography, I do not think that there is much evidence to suggest that Chronicles dates to the Hellenistic period. Since there are neither Greek words nor Hellenistic period historical events in Chronicles, a Hellenistic period composition date does not seem as likely as Persian period composition date. Furthermore, the apparent common *topoi* between Chronicles and Greek historiography are not nearly as explicit as those found in known Hellenistic historiography (eg. 2 Maccabees; 1-2 Esdras), discourses which obviously were influenced by the Hellenistic world (See Isaac Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His time, Place and Writing* [Studia Semitica Neerlandica 46; Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 2005], 41-65). For other discussions on dating Chronicles see, J. Dyck, *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler* (Biblical Interpretation Series 33; Leiden: Brill, 1998); Kai Peltonen, "A Jigsaw without a Model? The Date of Chronicles," in L. L. Grabbe (ed.), *Did Moses Speak Attic: Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period* (JSOTSup 317; ESHM 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 225-71.

[19] White defines "emplotment as "… the encodation of the facts contained in the chronicle [i.e., the external referent used to create the discourse] as components of specific *kinds* of plot structures, in precisely the way that Frye has suggested is the case with 'fictions' in general" (See White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 83).

[20] Rüsen defines historical *topoi* as "… forms of perception and representation within the texture of the historical sense of the past, which occur as repetitive patterns related to diverse contents" (Jörn Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches to Intercultural Comparative Historiography," *History and Theory* 35.4, Theme Issue 35: Chinese Historiography in Comparative Perspective [1996], 17).

Knoppers maintains that a better understanding of ancient historiographical conventions may be reached via cross-cultural comparisons and analyses: "Cross-cultural studies offer the benefits of comparing similar phenomena in a plurality of social settings, illuminating otherwise odd or inexplicable traits of certain literary works, exploring a set of problems in different societies, and calling attention to the unique features of a particular era of writing."[22] According to Ben Zvi, there were basic stories, or metanarratives, that transcended territorial boundaries.[23] Veyne compares the basic *topoi* that may influence a historian's discourse in a certain milieu to the external forces that influence the work of an artist or a scientist:

> At every period unconscious diagrams, *topoi* that are in the air of the time, impose themselves on a scientist or an artist... those "ready-made forms" that impose themselves with surprising strength on the imagination of artists and that are the matter of the work of art... an artist expresses himself through the visual possibilities of his time, which are a grammar of artistic communication, and that grammar has its own history, its slow rhythm, that determines the nature of styles and the manner of the artists... But, since a historical explanation does not descend by parachute from the sky, it remains to be concretely explained how the "ready-made forms" could almost imperatively impose themselves on an artist, for the artist does not "submit" to "influences"; the work of art is a doing, which uses sources and "influences" as material causes, in the same way that the sculptor uses marble as the material cause of his statue.[24]

This being said, it is important to acknowledge that possibly common or shared *topoi* in the ancient Near East and Mediterranean were appropriated in diverse manners and incorporated into unique discourses. In other words, due to unique and diverse socio-historical contexts, the significance of a *topos* was molded by each particular context in which it was intertwined. Importantly, the social and ideological processes reflecting this uniqueness may be illuminated through comparative studies.[25]

---

[21] Roland Barthes, "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives," in *Narratology: An Introduction*, 46.

[22] Gary N. Knoppers, "Greek Historiography and the Chronicler's History: A Reexamination," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122.4 (2003), 628.

[23] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."

[24] Paul Veyne, *Writing History: Essay on Epistemology* (Trans. M. Moore-Rinuolucri; Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1971), 94.

If comparative analysis is indeed a fruitful endeavour, then what should be compared? With the global nature of historiography, Woolf recognizes the need to make useful comparisons and contrasts between both individual historical texts and historical traditions; however, before such comparisons can be done effectively, a theoretical framework which identifies key concepts and themes that can be found in multiple historiographies is necessary.[26] Rüsen suggests that it is necessary to identify "… basic components and reconstruct them as a specific relationship and synthesis of various elements." Moreover, according to Rüsen, "[i]f it can be shown that these elements, or at least some of them, are the same in different manifestations of historiography, a comparative analysis can be done in a systematic way." In other words, "… the first step toward a comparative historiography is a theory of the main components of these specific cultural manifestations called historiography."[27] In Rüsen's view, *topoi* that facilitate comparison must be identified; the "most famous" *topos* is the past as a mirror—that is, historical discourses created by the emplotment of past events to teach lessons about the past that are applicable to the contemporary social world of intended audiences of the discourses. The *topos* of the past as mirror to the present "… teaches general rules of human conduct by examples."[28] A society's "social centre"[29] (i.e., a belief system, prevailing ideology, or institution with which a society identifies itself) is often a core of a narrative that includes the *topos* of the past as mirror; that is, lessons from the past are taught about a social centre, which exists in the intended audience's contemporary social world, and its relationship to a certain community or society.

---

[25] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."
[26] Daniel Woolf, "Of Nations, Nationalism, and National Identity: Reflections on the Historiographic Organization of the Past," *forthcoming.*
[27] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 11.

Rüsen also points out that

> [w]ith respect to the *cultural context of historiography* one should look at the culture's religious criteria for sense and meaning, since in most societies—at least of the premodern type—religion is the main source for a sense of the relationship between past and present… Its relationship to religion can function as a key to decipher the language of sense, meaning, and significance in historiography.[30]

This being said, the *topos* of divine providence in ancient historical discourses also facilitates intercultural comparison. In fact, it is my contention that the *topos* of divine providence is a major contributing factor to ancient historical discourses that include the *topos* of the past as a mirror in that it is divine actors who safeguard and protect the social centre of the discourse. In this sense, divine actors function as referees or judges and reward those who obey and punish those who violate the rules pertaining to the social centre of the discourse.

Ben Zvi states that "[l]iterary, social or ideological concerns frequent in ancient retellings of the past (e.g., matters of verisimilitude, authority of the speaker, or conformity with some trans-cultural folkloristic/ideological metanarratives in traditional societies) may, and were likely to raise analogous responses." Despite the unique discourses created in different milieus, similar "basic options" probably were available to authors and/or textual communities.[31] For example, historical narratives from ancient Israel, Mesopotamia, and Greece all exhibit instances in which moral behaviour and divine providence are associated with historical causation. Furthermore, all three traditions used past events as external referents to create historical narratives in which human behaviour and the divine response to that behaviour instructed a contemporary audience how to behave in the present. These narratives taught lessons to intended audiences by directing their attention to the importance or legitimacy of a social institution or prevailing ideology (i.e., social centre), which often is favoured or protected by the divine actor(s) in the narrative. Thus, historical narratives from ancient Israel, Mesopotamia, and Greece are comprised of external referents (i.e., past events) which were woven together into a chronological series through emplotment and used to teach a contemporary audience about their contemporary social world. Didactic historical narratives used social memories to "... socialize their members and those under their influence through these memories...."[32]

---

[28] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 17.
[29] The concept of the "social centre" and its roles in the formation of narratives will be discussed in detail in Chapter 1.
[30] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 16. Rüsen's emphasis.

An intent of this comparative study is to extirpate some fabricated barriers that are evident in the study of historical writing of the three traditions under examination, as well as challenge the ethnocentrism that is the by-product of such barriers. Searching for origins of historical writing based on genre imposition or familiarity, in my view, is an exclusionist endeavour which ultimately leads to rankings or hierarchies of pre-modern traditions that tell us more about ourselves as modern readers and our genre constructions than they do about the traditions under examination in this study.

---

[31] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."
[32] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."

When modern readers refer to Herodotus as either the "Father of History" or "Father of Lies", the readers' genre expectations for what we consider "history" is revealed. The former attribute (i.e., "Father of History") precludes the existence of historical writing before fifth century BCE Athens, a contention which I hope to dispute; the latter (i.e., "Father of Lies") reveals that a positivist genre construction has been imposed on Herodotus' discourse, since "Father of Lies" suggests that Herodotus did not properly record "history as it actually happened". Moreover, modern Western historiography often traces its roots back to Thucydides, since he may be recognized by some as the first positivist historian, a claim that reveals more about modern readers' ethnocentrism than it does about Thucydides discourse itself—especially if the reader considers the genre of historical during his or her time to be the pinnacle of historical writing, a view which leads to the devaluation of anything that deviates from this assumed standard or norm. As mentioned above, this is also the case for the historical discourses of Ssu-ma Chien, Ibn Khaldun, and Kalhana. Furthermore, such claims also suggest an evolution in historical discourses from Herodotus to Thucydides to the modern historian using the two sources to "accurately" reconstruct "what really happened" during the Persian Wars or Peloponnesian War; however, in my view, the modern historian, like Herodotus or Thucydides, uses external referents (the discourses and the events that inspired the formation of the discourses of

Herodotus and Thucydides) to create a narrative teaching an intended audience (readers of a book, students in a classroom, or colleagues at a conference) about past events. Additionally, also like Herodotus or Thucydides, the modern historian encodes his or her discourse conforming to the rules and limits of genre of that time period that have been agreed upon by both the creator of the discourse and the audience. This being said, different worldviews, thought patterns, and rules of genre are some of the aspects that separate the discourses of Herodotus and Thucydides from those of modern historians.

At the same time, hierarchies and ethnocentrism also emerge in comparisons of ancient Near East documents. For instance, Van Seters, using a revised version of Huizinga's definition of history,[33] "... examines the development of national histories and the history of the Israelites in particular," and as a result, contends that the first example of historical writing is to be found in sixth century BCE Israel, "[b]ecause most historical texts of the ancient Near East do not really fit this national sense of history writing...."[34] In my view, a problem with Van Seters' approach is that he attempts to establish a universal genre of history and impose it on the Near East, excluding Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Hittite historical writings, as these traditions that do not conform to his absolute genre which somehow transcends all temporal and spatial contingencies, and in the process he conveniently proves his own thesis that historical writing begins in Israel.

---

[33] Huizinga defines history as "... the intellectual form in which a civilization renders account to itself of its past" (See Johan Huizinga, "A Definition of the Concept of History," in R. Klibansky and H.J. Patton [eds.], *Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer* [New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963], 9.)

[34] John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of History* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 1.

Van Seters' definition of history is influenced by the nineteenth century European concepts of the "nation" and corporate identity. Kuhrt posits that this is also the problem with Momigliano's work on ancient Near Eastern historiography. See Amelie Kuhrt, "Israelite and Near Eastern Historiography," in A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø (eds.), *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 80: Brill, 1998), 257-79.

Rüsen cautions against theories of cultural differences that have "… a dangerous tendency to essentialize or even reify the single cultures concerned… A typology of cultural differences, a necessary heuristic construct, has to avoid characterizing cultures as pre-given units and entities."[35] These so-called "pre-given units and entities" do not exist *a priori* but rather are the construction of dominant discourses. Importantly, Said recognized that the identity of "Asia" as some sort of monolithic and distinct entity was constructed by dominant European discourses. According to Said:

> Neither "Europe" nor "Asia" was anything without the visionaries' technique for turning vast geographical domains into treatable, and manageable, entities. At bottom, therefore, Europe and Asia were *our* Europe and *our* Asia—our *will* and *representation*, as Schopenhauer had said. Historical laws were in reality *historians'* laws, just as "the two forms of humanity" drew attention less to actuality than to a European capacity for lending man-made distinctions an air of inevitability.[36]

Furthermore, Rüsen argues that

> [t]he idea that cultures are pre-given units and entities is committed to a cultural logic which grounds identity on a fundamental difference between inside and outside. Such logic conceptualizes identity as a mental territory with clear borderlines and a correspondingly sharp division between self and other. This logic is essentially ethnocentric, and ethnocentrism is inscribed into a typology of cultural differences which treats cultures as coherent units which can be clearly separated from each other.[37]

Instead, Rüsen calls for a theoretical conceptualization that avoids ethnocentrism. This study attempts to implement a theoretical apparatus in which certain objects of study (i.e., historiographical traditions) are not privileged over others as a result of similarities or familiarities with the "self" (contemporary Western historical discourses and genre constructions). Furthermore, the traditions under examination in this study should not be compartmentalized and represented as isolated units. In Rüsen's words, "[w]e avoid ethnocentrism if a specific culture is understood as a combination of elements which are shared by all other cultures. Thus the specificity of cultures is brought about by different constellations of the same elements."[38] In other words, it is necessary to identify common *topoi* and analyze how they manifest in different traditions and/or milieus. Such an approach "… includes otherness rather than uses it as a principle of segregation; it encourages recognition and mutuality in people of different cultures."[39]

---

[35] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 11.

[36] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003), 115.

[37] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 11.

This thesis compares *topoi* in Chronicles, namely the past as a mirror and the role of divine providence, to apparently similar *topoi* in Babylonian historical narratives, Herodotus' *Histories*, and Xenophon's *Hellenica*. More specifically, this thesis analyzes the relationship between divine providence and the apparent social centre around which narratives are created, and what each text may have been trying to teach its intended audience about this relationship. In doing so, this thesis neither seeks origins of the common *topoi* nor looks for direct influence of any one text on another.

Chapter 1 of this thesis examines the concept of the past as a mirror and the relationship between a society, its social centre, its social memories (i.e., external referents), and the formation of historical narratives. Additionally, this chapter considers how genres are constructed and negotiated in specific traditions, as well as how genres are temporally and spatially contingent. Chapter 2 analyzes the relationship between narrative, didacticism, and divine providence in Chronicles, Mesopotamian historical narratives, the *Histories*, and the *Hellenica.* Chapter 3 looks at the concept of paradigmatic individuals and embedded texts before attempting to identify examples in Chronicles, Mesopotamian historical narratives, the *Histories*, and the *Hellenica*, and then attempts to explain how they function in these texts. Chapter 4 explores the use of the legitimate central cultic place and its relationship to illegitimate periphery spaces in Chronicles and Babylonian historical narratives. Chapter 5 discusses the "restorer of order" *topos* in ancient Near Eastern historiography, and examines how this *topos* functions in Chronicles, the Cyrus Cylinder, and Royal Assyrian Inscriptions, namely those of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon. Chapter 6 analyzes how central disastrous events are explained by both immediate and deferred retribution (i.e., individual and collective punishment) in Chronicles, the *Histories*, and the *Hellenica.* Finally, Chapter 7 discusses and compares the roles of the prophet in Chronicles to those of the wise advisor in the *Histories.*

---

[38] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 11.
[39] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 11.

In concentrating on the similarities between Chronicles and the discourses to which it is compared, it is not my intention to downplay the differences or to suggest these are identical stories that used similar patterns for similar ends. Rather, each text considered in this thesis represents a unique discourse with very different core messages for a different intended audience; that is, each text is the product of a unique social world. Therefore, even if historical narratives from ancient Israel, Mesopotamia, and Greece may have functioned didactically and used comparable narrative patterns, each text carried its own unique ideological message, which was shaped by the text's social world. For instance, Ben Zvi details important differences between ancient Israelite discourses and those of other ancient cultures:

> Similar considerations may be raised about comparisons between DH [Deuteronomistic History] and CHR [Chronicles] on the one hand and the works of Herodotus, Thucydides or Xenophon on the other. Neither the discourses of the literati of Achaemenid Jerusalem nor the social conditions associated with their writing and reading books such as Kings and Chronicles would have allowed or encouraged the writings of works such as those of Herodotus, Thucydides or Xenophon or for that matter Josephus.[40]

In other words, the differences abound; in fact, the differences are more apparent than the similarities.

Chronicles' Relationship to Mesopotamian and Greek Historiography

Chronicles exhibits ancient Near Eastern ideologies and narrative patterns, since its narrative centers on a national deity, the deity's central space (i.e. its city and temple/cult), and a local dynasty. This is, of course, of little surprise since ancient Yehudite literati created discourses for multiple genres (i.e., wisdom literature, prophetic literature, historiography) using shared basic conventions also used by other ancient Near Eastern literati. In short, Chronicles, like any other book in the Hebrew Bible, is entrenched in greater ancient Near Eastern traditions. However, it is important to mention that although Chronicles shares much in common with ancient Babylonian historiography, the compositions were created in unique social settings in which ideological intentions differed from those of their Babylonian and other Near Eastern counterparts.

---

[40] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."

Momigliano considered post-exilic Israelite historiography and fifth century Greek historiography to be parallel phenomena.[41] The ancient Israelites and Greeks used common ancient historiographical conventions such as citations, stock/exaggerated numbers for the purpose of authentication, genealogies, in addition to references to divine retribution and the role of prophets/wise advisors. It is noteworthy that Knoppers contends that the closest counterpart to the phenomenon of 1 Chronicles 1-9 (Chronicles' genealogy) may be found in the works of the Greek genealogists.[42] Knoppers adds that ancient Greece does offer national histories that may be compared with the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles.[43] Close contact between the ancient Israelites and Greeks during the Hellenistic period (323-30 BCE) is, of course, well known, but a great deal of physical evidence has been unearthed indicating cultural contact between the two groups during the Persian period (550-330 BCE) as well.[44] Thus, Greek contact with Yehud/Judah preceded Alexander by centuries, as Persian period archaeological evidence, as well as archaeological evidence from even earlier periods,[45] reveals. In fact, Knoppers refers to the fifth and fourth centuries as "a time of rapid Hellenization" in Judah.[46] It was during the Persian and Hellenistic periods that "... intellectual elites from a variety of societies found themselves confronted with empires aspiring to dominate the entire ancient Mediterranean world. These societies were both united and divided by trade, travel, taxation, and war."[47] In sum, the Chronicler, Herodotus, and Xenophon, who were near contemporaries, shared a common fifth to fourth century BCE eastern Mediterranean socio-historical setting and may have shared some narrative patterns, possibly through diffusion or cultural contact.

---

[41] Arnaldo Momigliano, "Elements in Jewish, and Greek, Historiography," *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1977), 26.

[42] Knoppers, "Greek Historiography," 633.

[43] Knoppers, "Greek Historiography and the Chronicler," 628.

[44] See Charles E. Carter, *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study* (JSOTSup 294; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 249, 256-57. Meyers states that archaeology teaches us that the influence of the Greeks in Yehud predated Alexander. By the fifth century BCE, the initial signs of the appeal of Greek culture had began to emerge in Yehud: "the adoption of coinage as a medium of exchange along with the use as the standard of the Attic tetradrachm with Greek symbols, such as the Athenian owl; the establishment of Greek trading emporia along the coastal plain; the importation of Attic black-glazed ceramic wares as luxury items; and the opening of new trade routes connecting the Persian Gulf with the Aegean as well as others that would bring Egypt in closer touch with both the Levant and the Aegean." Numerous Palestinian sites, both inland and coastal, have yielded statues of Greek figures. All of this occurred in Persian Yehud ("Jewish Culture in Greco-Roman Palestine," in D. Biale (ed.), *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* [New York: Schocken Books, 2002], 140-41).

---

[45] The Israelites may have had cultural contact with the Greeks, probably indirectly, as early as the eighth century BCE. Preceding Hellenism, the first Greek colonization (eighth to sixth centuries BCE) reached the Levant by the eighth century; sites like Al Mina on the Orontes River have left ample physical remains to indicate that the Greeks and the denizens of the Levant were in contact with one another. Eighth century Greek pottery has been unearthed from coastal sites in the Levant, such as Tyre (which even has some tenth century Greek sherds). But the quantities of Greek pottery unearthed at Al Mina in the eighth century greatly exceed the amounts discovered at other Near Eastern sites. During this period, it is thought that the Northwest Semitic alphabet was diffused to the Greeks; in addition to this, it is also thought that artistic and literary conventions diffused across the Mediterranean (Robin Osborne, *Greece in the Making: 1200-479 BC* [New York: Routledge, 1996], 112-13).

[46] Knoppers, "Greek Historiography and the Chronicler," 648.

[47] Knoppers, "Greek Historiography and the Chronicler," 650.

1. The Past as a Mirror: History as a Didactic Narrative

1.1 Past as a Mirror: A Cross-Cultural Phenomenon

Rüsen states that when people remember, interpret, and represent the past, they understand their present and formulate a system by which future generations may assess themselves and their world. In this sense, a society's interpretive recollection of the past serves as a means to orient that group in the present. Furthermore, Rüsen contends that "… making sense of the past in respect to cultural orientation in the present is a starting point for intercultural comparison."[1]

According to Rüsen, contingency is a universal experience of time during which human existence is vexed by a sense of ruptures, unexpected events, catastrophes, and unfulfilled expectations. Contingent events are interpreted by cultures and made into meaningful events through which human activities and change may be comprehended.[2] White delineates an analysis regarding the impact of "traumatic" events on historical discourses similar to that of Rüsen.

> [T]he greatest historians have always dealt with those events in the histories of their cultures which are "traumatic" in nature and the meaning of which is either problematic or overdetermined in the significance that they still have for the current life, events such as revolutions, civil wars, large-scale processes such as industrialization and urbanization, or in situations which have lost their original function in a society but continue to play an important role on the current social scene. In looking at ways in which such structures took shape or evolved, historians *re*familiarize them, but also by showing how their developments conformed to one or another of the story types that we conventionally invoke to make sense of our own life-histories.[3]

Examples of contingency that were central to the formation of historical discourses considered in this study include the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple and the subsequent exile and return in Chronicles; the continual flux of kings and dynastic change in Mesopotamian historical discourses; the Persian Wars and the subsequent new political structure and role of Athens in fifth century BCE in the *Histories*; and the Peloponnesian War, imperialism, and continual conflict and shifts in political power (particularly the demise of Sparta) in the Hellenic world during the late fifth and early fourth centuries BCE in the *Hellenica*.

---

[1] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 8.

[2] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 11-12.

[3] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 87.

In Rüsen's words, "[t]he experience of structurally threatening temporal change has to be interpreted in order to enable the people who are threatened by it to go on with their lives."[4] Cultures construct ideas of temporal order in response to the challenge of contingency. To Rüsen, the work of historical consciousness then can be described as a procedure by which an idea of temporal order manifests itself. Thus, historical consciousness makes sense of past change and applies it to understanding the present, and historical narration (i.e., historiography) is the medium through which this process occurs.[5]

What Rüsen refers to as the "historical sense" is "… an image, a vision, a concept, or an idea of time which mediates the expectations, desires, hopes, threats, and anxieties connecting the minds of people in their present-day activities with the experience of the past."[6] Furthermore, "recalled real time" is synthesized with the "projected future", at which time the past and future are fused into "… an entire image, vision, or concept of temporal change and development which functions as an integral past of cultural orientation in the present."[7] For instance, Chronicles is an example of a present-oriented discourse that fused the past with the future, as it was a narrative medium representing a past through which Persian Yehudites were instructed about how to behave in the present and how to imagine possible futures.[8]

---

[4] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 12.
[5] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 12.
[6] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 13.

Finally, Rüsen provides examples of the conceptualization of time as a "meaningful order of human activities", including regular and incessant cycles of order and disorder, divine governance of the world, and a moral world order,[9] all of which are evident in ancient historical discourses. Rüsen contends that a comparative approach to historiography must identify

> … these *criteria for historical sense and meaning…* So we can explicate a system of basic concepts governing historiography as a whole, structuring its way of transforming the experience of the past into a history with sense and meaning for the present. Such a system uncovers the semantics of history and creates the grounds for comparison.[10]

1.2 History, Narrative, and Didacticism

Before engaging in a discussion on the relationship between history, narrative, and didacticism, it is important to mention that although this thesis deals primarily with historical narratives, I acknowledge that narrative is only one of many possible ways to represent or depict past events or social memories of past events. For instance, ancient Near Eastern historical representations need not have been in narrative form. The relief section of the Behistun Inscription and the reliefs of Jehu of Israel and the ruler of Gilzanu on the Black Obelisk, as well as

---

[7] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 13.
[8] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."
[9] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 13.
[10] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches," 13. Rüsen's emphasis.

Assyrian reliefs in general, represent events recorded in inscriptions.[11] Furthermore, poetry was used to depict past events in Judges 5 and 1 Chron. 16:8-36. In addition to the ancient Near Eastern examples, one has to consider only two other instances to realize that the "narrative proper" form does not have exclusive rights over historical discourses: Samuel Daniel's poetic representations of the past[12] and Inca *khipus* (knots).[13] For such reasons, I propose a definition of history that recognizes the contingency and relativity of genre, as well as the multiple forms of historical discourses and historical representations; that is, my definition of history includes a culturally, temporally, and spatially contingent discourse or other form of representation that encodes external referents (i.e., agreed upon social memories) so that these referents are presented in a manner that conforms to the rules of genre of that form of representation in a given society.

By instilling the past with meaning for the present, authors of historical discourses transcend the subject-object dichotomy—that is, the positivist view that the subject (the historian) attempts to study the object ("the past") "objectively". In other words, instead of viewing the subject-object relationship as an active-passive encounter, perhaps one also should consider the possibility that the relationship may be more complex than a simple dichotomy would allow.

---

[11] I also recognize the fact that some view visual representations as narratives; however, my statements above refer to the traditional definition of narrative consisting of a prose discourse.

[12] For discussions see Arthur B. Ferguson, "The Historical Thought of Samuel Daniel: A Study in Renaissance Ambivalence," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32 (1971), 185-202; Daniel R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart: Erudition, Ideology, and "Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990) (Chapter 3).

[13] See Gary Urton, "From Knots to Narrative: Reconstructing the Art of Historical Record Keeping in the Andes from Spanish Transcriptions of Inka *Khipus*," *Ethnohistory* 45.3 (1998), 410-38. Urton concludes that "... through a loose reading and analysis of transcriptions of several khipus is the capacity of these devices for encoding historical and other narratives in the form of complex grammatical constructions" (431).

Ankersmit posits that the Greek middle voice may help explain the concept of subject-object transcendence; for instance, the Greek verb λουω may be active (λούω: "I wash"), passive (λούομαι: "I am washed"), or middle (λούομαι: "I wash myself"). Ankersmit points to Barthes' consideration of using the verb "to write" in the middle voice as "I write myself" to delineate how the subject-object dichotomy is overcome.

> According to Barthes, using the verb in this novel way would enable us to express the fact that we may sometimes truly become ourselves in and by the act of writing. For writing may show us what we really think and who we really are: in that case we effectively 'realize ourselves' in and by writing. In this way we enter into a contact with ourselves that transcends the subject/object dichotomy.[14]

Historians filter referential information through subjective lenses, which are shaped by their contemporary worlds that include prevailing ideologies and social institutions, and create didactic narratives for contemporary intended audiences. These subjective lenses are similar to Bal's "focalization", a perspective from which events always are presented. Bal describes focalization as a point of view that is chosen, "… a certain way of seeing things, a certain angle, whether 'real' historical facts are concerned or fictitious events."[15] Moreover, White posits that historical narratives do not reproduce the events narrated but rather they tell the reader from which vantage point she or he should view the events and charges the individual's perceptions of the events with "different emotional valences."[16] In this sense history is *not* an objective account of the past, nor can we expect it to be a "science of facts". In White's view, "'[h]istory' can be set over against 'science' by virtue of its want of conceptual vigor and failure to produce the kinds of universal laws that the sciences characteristically seek to produce."[17] Similarly, Veyne delineates the difference between history and physical sciences as follows:

---

[14] F.R. Ankersmit, "Hayden White's Appeal to Historians," *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998), 190.
[15] Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2nd edn, 1997), 142.
[16] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 91.

> The true difference is not between historical facts and physical facts, but between historiography and physical science. Physics is a body of laws, and history a body of facts. Physics is not a body of physical facts related and explained; it is the corpus of laws that will be used to explain those facts. To the physicist the existence of the sun and the moon, even the cosmos, is an anecdote that can be used only to establish Newton's laws... For the historian that is not the case; if there were (supposing there could be) a science that was the corpus of the laws of history, history would not be that science; it would be the corpus of the facts that those laws explained.[18]

It may be argued that if one is most interested in positivist approaches and seeks an objective account of the past (i.e., "history as it actually happened"), the referential information, and not the narrative itself, may be the place to look. For instance, Finkelstein has stated the following in regards to Mesopotamian historiography: "Upon analysis, it would appear that all genres of Mesopotamian literature that purports to deal with past events, with the exception of the omens and chronicles, are motivated by purposes other than the desire to know what really happened...."[19]

Although I am in agreement with Rüsen, White, and Veyne, many historians do not accept a narrativist approach to historical discourses, and it is important to give a voice to those who dispute the narrativist approach. Zagorin argues that "postmodernism" does not contribute a tenable set of theories, since such theories are "[f]ounded on a mistaken conception of the nature and function of language," fail to recognize "... some of the strongest intuitions and convictions that historians bring to their work," and do not "... illuminate the nature of history as a discipline dedicated in principle to a true depiction of the past."[20] Moreover, Monkkonen, likely representing the views of many of his colleagues, asserts that "... historians give reality an ontological primacy over writing, or discourse, which they produce about reality"[21] and that historians' "... epistemological certainty is justified... [t]hat is, in principle, the past is knowable."[22]

---

[17] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 89.

[18] Veyne, *Writing History*, 10-11.

[19] J.J. Finkelstein, "Mesopotamian Historiography," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 107.6 (1963), 469.

White in particular has been a lightning rod for criticisms by fellow historians, and not surprisingly, his work has not been generally accepted by historians. In fact, Monkkonen has stated that "... only the tiniest handful of historians would concur..." with White.[23] According to Kansteiner, White's work has appealed to few historians and even fewer have applied his methods.[24] Given Vann's assessment of the impact of White's work, Monkkonen's and Kansteiner's conclusions about White's limited influence on historians seem valid. This being said, although White has yet to make a significant impact on historians, Vann points out that White's work has been accepted widely by other disciplines.

> The statistically inclined may wonder whether my figure for the declining, indeed almost disappearing, percentage of historians citing White is not in part a statistical artifact. Since there are so many more literary scholars than historians, there are that many more people "at risk," as statisticians say, of having read and cited White... The work of Hayden White has had a remarkable influence outside the profession [history], making him perhaps the most widely quoted

---

[20] Perez Zagorin, "History, the Referent, and Narrative: Reflections on Postmodernism Now," *History and Theory* 38.1 (1999), 24.
[21] Eric H. Monkkonen, "The Challenge of Quantitative History," *Historical Methods* 17.3 (1984), 87-88.
[22] Monkkonen, "Challenge of Quantitative History," 89.
[23] Monkkonen, "Challenge of Quantitative History," 93.
[24] Wulf Kansteiner, "Hayden White's Critique of the Writing of History," *History and Theory* 32.3 (1993), 294.

> historian of our time. But historians have almost entirely tuned out, especially in the United States (if it were not for the interest in White in the German historical profession from the late 1980s, the anemic figures would have been even more unimpressive).[25]

Given that narrativist theories strike at the heart of the discipline by challenging the notion that language is able to represent reality, White's lack of appeal to historians is not surprising.

The main problems I perceive in Zagorin's and Monkkonen's arguments are the essentialist statements. Zagorin's claim that "postmodernist" theories fail to "… illuminate the nature of history as a discipline dedicated in principle to a true depiction of the past" is extremely problematic, as is Monkkonen's assertion that epistemological certainty is justified because the past can be known. First, is it possible to identify the "nature of history" from the Sumerian King List to contemporary historical discourses? Have historical discourses and other forms of historical representation not been in a state of flux over millennia? Whose vantage point reveals the true nature of history? Have different cultures and different temporal settings not defined the purpose of history in myriad ways? That is, is one's concept of the true nature of history not culturally, temporally, and spatially contingent? Has Zagorin not essentialized his construction of the true nature of history? What is a true depiction of the past? True in what sense? True as in a community believed it to be true, or true as in an epistemological certainty? Is epistemological certainty possible? Is the past truly knowable? What about the epistemological certainty about marginalized groups whose voices have yet to be heard?

---

[25] Richard T. Vann, "The Reception of Hayden White," *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998), 148-49.

I agree with Ankersmit that historical reality is not something that is stumbled upon like tables and chairs in room once one has entered it.[26] I think that Zagorin and Monkkonen, like the ancient historian, have "written themselves" by writing history; that is, Zagorin's and Monkkonen's claims reveal more about their cultural identity and how their culture engages "history" than they do about historical reality or epistemological certainty.[27] Just as Chronicles tells us more about historical writing in Persian Yehud than it does about so-called historical reality of the monarchic period, Zagorin and Monkkonon tell us more about contemporary Western views on the "nature of history" than they do about the historical reality of the period to which they apply these methods. In Ankersmit's words, "[h]istorical reality… is only encountered in our attempts to define our relationship to our past, in our attempt to 'write ourselves' by writing history. Here history functions as the mirror of the radically alien in which we begin to recognize our own cultural identity."[28] In agreement with narrativist theorists, it is my contention that external referents (i.e., agreed upon social memories) are emplotted to create historical narratives into which people "write themselves" and their social worlds.

White asks: "Does the world really present itself to perception in the form of well-made stories, with central subjects, proper beginnings, middles, and ends? Or does it present itself more in the forms that annals and chronicles suggest, either as mere sequence without beginning or end or beginnings that only terminate and never conclude?"[29]

---

[26] Ankersmit, "Hayden White's Appeal to Historians," 193.
[27] See Ankersmit, "Hayden White's Appeal to Historians," 191-93.
[28] Ankersmit, "Hayden White's Appeal to Historians," 193.

White points out that events cannot speak, and therefore, do not narrate themselves. Rather, events, which function as *referents* for a discourse, can be spoken of but cannot pose as the *tellers* of the narrative. "Narrative becomes a *problem* only when we wish to give *real* events the *form* of a story."[30] Since events do not take the form of a story, human agents must perceive and/or interpret events or representations of events and subjectively form coherent narratives out of them.[31] Thus, the relationship between events is not "immanent in the events themselves" but rather exists only in the mind of the person reflecting on them.[32] Zagorin disputes White's position for two reasons.

> The first is that ordinary human perceptions are not chaotic experiencing, but consistent naturally of structured and meaningful configurations… human experience and activity are narratively structured, so that people can and do find sequences and stories in their life histories that make sense of their own past and present. Such narratives are likewise implicit in the collective experience and actions that have had the effect of uniting individuals into larger groups and communities whose members are conscious of possessing a common identity through the narratives they share. The second reason is that historical facts are not mere isolated entities but can be seen in an immanent relationship to other facts and to exhibit an intelligible structure and order which allows the historian to treat them as distinctive structures.[33]

It seems as though Zagorin's first argument consists of a chicken or egg scenario; that is, are human perceptions structured and meaningful configurations, or do humans create structured and meaningful configurations from their perceptions of random events? I think that the latter is more likely. Similarly, in my view, human experience is not narratively structured but rather humans create narrative structures out of their experiences. In other words, experiences and events are emplotted and narratives are the result of this emplotment. As for Zagorin's second point, it is my contention that authors of historical discourse create relationships between events and construct the so-called intelligible structures through processes of selection and emplotment. In other words, not all events are included in a historical discourse—authors decide which events to include and which to exclude—and those events that are included are woven together through emplotment.

---

[29] White, "Value of Narrativity," 27.
[30] Hayden White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," *Critical Inquiry* 7.1 (1980), 8.
[31] White, "Value of Narrativity," 15.
[32] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 94.
[33] Zagorin, "History, the Referent, and Narrative," 20.

White goes on to argue that a historical narrative needs a social centre with which authors can rank and organize the narration of events; and it is through this social centre that authors are able to instill events with moral or ethical significance.[34] Anchor forwards an analysis similar to that of White.

> Narrative theory shows beyond a doubt that the world is never given to us in the form of well-made stories, that we make up such stories, that we give them referentiality by imagining that in them the world yields up its various meanings, and that historical narratives, no less than fictional narratives, always serve in one way or another, to legitimize an actual or ideal social reality.[35]

For White, a social centre constitutes a system of human relationships governed by the laws that sustain it. All events, conflicts, struggles, and triumphs are interpreted and presented through the scope of the social centre and its governing laws. According to White, "[p]erhaps, then, the growth and development of historical consciousness which is attended by a concomitant growth and development of narrative capability… has something to do with the extent to which the legal system functions as a subject of concern."[36] Similarly, Pocock suggests that awareness of the past "… is a social awareness and can exist only as part of a generalized awareness of the structure and behaviour of a society."[37] Moreover, since societies are structured around self-preservation, it is reasonable to contend that the function of the "preservation of statements about the past" is to contribute to the continuity of a community and its structures. Therefore, an analysis of a society's historical awareness probably should begin by considering the social structures, institutions, and prevailing ideologies in the historian's/author's present which are a catalyst for an awareness of a past.[38]

---

[34] White, "Value of Narrativity," 15.

[35] Anchor, "Narrativity," 133-34.

[36] White, "Value of Narrativity," 17.

With a social system at the core of narrative, White concludes that if every "fully realized story" is a kind of allegory, "then it seems possible to conclude that every historical narrative has as its latent or manifest purpose the desire to *moralize* the events which it treats."[39] Moreover, it then follows that narrativity in "factual storytelling" (i.e., historiography), and probably in "fictional storytelling" as well, "… is intimately related to, if not a function of, the impulse to moralize reality, that is, to identify it with the social system that is the source of any morality that we can imagine."[40] In sum, where there is narrative, there is a moralizing impulse.[41]

For White, narrative, and its innate ability to moralize, is what separates "history" from annals and chronicles. According to White, annals lack narrative components, and chronicles, although appearing to tell a story, fail to achieve narrative status since they lack "narrative *closure*"; that is, a chronicle begins to tell a story but terminates without conclusion when the story breaks off in the chronicler's own present. In White's words, "[w]hile annals represent reality *as if* real events did not display the form of story, the chronicle represents it *as if* real events appeared to human consciousness in the form of *unfinished* stories."[42]

---

[37] J.G.A. Pocock, "The Origins of the Study of the Past," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 4 (1961–1962), 211.
[38] Pocock, "Origins of the Study of the Past," 211-13.
[39] White, "Value of Narrativity," 17-18.
[40] White, "Value of Narrativity," 18.
[41] White, "Value of Narrativity,"26.

It should be noted that although annals and chronicles are not narratives by White's definition, they are, however, emplotted in the sense that the information presented is selected, compiled, and ordered for a specific end, which, like historical narratives, is influenced by the social world of the compiler(s); the inclusion and exclusion of certain events, as well as the ordering of the events, is evidence of emplotment—that is, the information in and structure of an annal or chronicle may reveal as much about a socio-historical context as does a narrative. Thus, I do not accept White's claim that narrative is what separates history, annals, and chronicles. In my view, historical narratives, annals, and chronicles are all historical discourses and all suggest historical consciousness. By eliminating annals and chronicles from writing history, White creates a very narrow category for history, a category in which little Mesopotamian and Hittite historical writing is included. Perhaps then it is better to use the term "historical discourses", which includes historical narratives (i.e., what White calls history), annals, and chronicles.

White uses the *Annals of Saint Gall*, a medieval European annal that lists events in Gaul during the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, as his evidence of "… the annalist's apparent failure to see that historical events dispose themselves to the percipient eye as 'stories' *waiting* to be told, waiting to be narrated."[43] Partner disagrees with White's analysis of the annal when she states that "… even the monk of St. Gall was not immune to this deep process of selection and revision and was distractedly busy with the continuous, full, connected story of himself, even as he absently inscribed his rudimentary event fragments in the right-hand column of his non-history."[44] I agree with Partner's critique of White's use of the *Annals of Saint Gall.* Additionally, ancient Near Eastern annals such as the Sumerian King List—which Kuhrt calls a manipulated list[45]—also provide an important nuance lacking in White's analysis. Although the Sumerian King List is not a narrative, it does tell a story about the origins of kingship and the flux of dynastic change. In fact, according to Glassner, "[t]he Chronicle of the Single Monarchy [the Sumerian King List] was an official canon reflecting the views of its times. The indisputable quality of the work makes it a source of the first importance for the study of historical writing and political thought at the end of the third millennium."[46] Additionally, Glassner posits that the Sumerian King List provides a framework for political and social concepts, and validates institutions, practices, and customs "… by its power of naming and classification."[47] In light of this evidence, one may conclude that in the Sumerian King List, just as in a historical narrative, external referents are emplotted (i.e., past events) and a social centre is revealed.

---

[42] White, "Value of Narrativity," 9.

---

[43] White, "Value of Narrativity," 10.

[44] Nancy Partner, "Hayden White: The Form of the Content," *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998), 166-67.

[45] Kuhrt, "Israelite and Near Eastern Historiography," 261.

[46] Jean-Jacques Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles* (Ed. B.R. Foster; Writings from the Ancient World 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 70.

[47] Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 56.

Similarly, I would not suggest that the Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian Chronicle Series, which do not tell a story explicitly, are not historical writing. In fact, in a positivist sense of history, these chronicles probably conform better to modern standards of historiography than do Babylonian historical narratives, including the narrative-style chronicles (eg. the Weidner Chronicle[48]). The dry and sober Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian Chronicle Series are renowned for their apparent objectivity, as they mention both Babylonian victories and defeats. This being said, Kuhrt points out that the literary style of these Babylonian chronicles is "frustratingly laconic" and that ".... there is practically no literary elaboration or attempt to tell a story."[49] Kuhrt's latter point obviously supports White's case that chronicles fall short of telling a story. However, it is important to recognize that the Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian Chronicle Series are not bereft of emplotment—the selected, compiled, and ordered material included in the chronicles is told from a Babylonian perspective.

Following White's model, the historian then takes information from annals or chronicles and creates a narrative, similar to what Kings and Chronicles claim to do. In other words, past events as presented in annals and chronicles may function as external referents from which the historian creates a narrative. It is important to mention that past events used as referents are not limited by historicity and include social memories, which may lack historicity, accepted as true by the author(s) and the receiving audience(s).

---

[48] Since this text was designated the Weidner Chronicle, a complete Neo-Babylonian temple library with tablets *in situ* on the shelves has been discovered at Sippar, and a complete manuscript of what is known as the Weidner Chronicle was found among these tablets. This important discovery has cast doubt whether the Weidner Chronicle is actually a chronicle. Al Rawi states that "[i]t is now clear that the composition is in the form of a literary letter supposedly written by a king of Isin to a king of Babylon (or Larsa), presumably his contemporary" (F.N.H. Al-Rawi, "Tablets from the Sippar Library. I. The 'Weidner Chronicle': A Supposititious Royal Letter Concerning a Vision," *Iraq* 52 [1990], 1). Although this text appears to be a letter, and not a chronicle, in my view, it still is an invaluable source for understanding Mesopotamian historiography, as well as an important source for this study. The text is a narrative with a didactic message and uses external referents/core facts (i.e., Mesopotamian social memories) to create the narrative, and therefore, in my view, constitutes a historical narrative.
[49] Kuhrt, "Israelite and Near Eastern Historiography," 266.

According to Bal, "[m]emory is an act of 'vision' of the past but, as an act, situated in the present of the memory."[50] Thus, the social memories of a community, or that which a community believes to be true, are also acts that are situated in and shaped by the present. Both the author(s) and the intended audience have to agree on the validity of a social memory (i.e., the external referent) and accept the narrative created from the external referent as a truthful representation of the past. Although the historicity of the external referent may be important to many modern readers, for ancient audiences, "[t]he text had to be 'true' in regards to '(ideological) meaningfulness and significance *and* be consistent with a set of core facts about the past that were agreed upon within the community."[51] For instance, the "core facts"[52] (i.e., agreed upon social memories) embedded in Genesis or Exodus narratives likely were just as "real" to ancient Yehudites as those in Chronicles.[53] Thus, the line between "history" and "fiction" is virtually non-existent in ancient Israelite narratives, mainly "... because of the strong historical consciousness permeating the discourses of ancient Israel...."[54] The same can be said about ancient Mesopotamian and Greek discourses, as well. Regarding Greek social memory and past referentiality of the Trojan War, Hall states:

---

[50] Bal, *Narratology*, 147.

[51] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."

[52] Ben Zvi defines core facts as "... the basic outline of the story... that were agreed upon by the community" ("General Observations"). For a discussion on "core facts" see Ehud Ben Zvi, "Malleability and its Limits: Sennacherib's Campaign against Judah as a Case-Study," in L.L. Grabbe, *'Like a Bird in a Cage: The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE* (JSOTSup 363; ESHM 4; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 73-105; *idem*, "Shifting the Gaze: Historiographic Constraints in Chronicles and Their Implications," in M.P. Graham and J.A. Dearman (eds.), *The Land that I will Show You: Essays on History and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honour of J. Maxwell Miller* (JSOTSup 343; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 38-60.

[53] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."

> The distinction assumed here between 'mythical' and 'historical' has not been accepted by all scholars. It is often said that the Greeks recognized no such distinction; the evidence most frequently invoked in support of this claim is the rationalist historian Thucydides' belief in the historicity of the Trojan wars and of Agamemnon's generalship (Thuc. 1.9). When it comes to the view of historical figures from well beyond the living memory the distinction between history and myth indeed becomes invalid.[55]

According to Rüsen, "[f]or comparative purposes it is important to know how this *relationship to the so-called facts* [core facts] of the past is organized and presented."[56] This brings about the inevitable question: What distinguishes history from fiction in ancient discourses?

1.3 Genre: History and Fiction

Another factor which further blurs the line between history and fiction is "metanarrative discourse" within a tradition or culture. This is what White refers to when he discusses the encodation of events in terms of plot structures that "... a culture has of making sense of both personal and public pasts."[57] Furthermore, White maintains that events are familiarized to an intended audience, "not only because the reader now has more *information* about the events, but also because he has been shown how the data conform to an *icon* of a comprehensible finished process, a plot structure with which he is familiar as a part of his cultural endowment."[58] For such reasons, White concludes that "[t]he historical narrative thus mediates between the events reported in it on the one side and pregeneric plot structures conventionally used in [a] culture to endow unfamiliar events and situations with meanings, on the other."[59] Finally, White argues that "[b]y suggesting alternative emplotments of a given sequence of historical events, historians provide all of the possible meanings with which the literary art of a culture is capable of endowing them."[60]

---

[54] See Ben Zvi, "General Observations"; See also Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 12.
[55] Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 64-65.
[56] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches,"14. Rüsen's emphasis.
[57] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 85.

The use of metanarrative discourses, or "pregeneric plot structures", may authenticate accounts of unfamiliar events. In other words, metanarratives filter a novel message through a pre-established medium. Japhet surmises that the model of the "Restoration" in Ezra-Nehemiah utilized narrative structures and patterns from the Book of Exodus.

> The picture of the Restoration as a time span of two consecutive generations, with a political system characterized by leadership of two leaders, a layman and a priest, follows a venerable historical and literary model: the Exodus from Egypt, followed by the conquest and settlement in the land of Israel... The analogy between the return from the Babylonian Exile and the Exodus from Egypt is a well-known biblical concept and is explicitly proclaimed by Jeremiah and Second Isaiah.[61]

Japhet's contention makes a great deal of sense, particularly if the Exodus narrative had an authoritative status at the time of the composition(s) of Ezra-Nehemiah, since this would have been a case of presenting new referential material via the medium of an already accepted and authoritative metanarrative.

---

[58] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 86.
[59] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 88.
[60] White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 92.
[61] Sara Japhet, "Periodization between History and Ideology II: Chronology and Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah," in O. Lipschits and M. Oeming (eds.), *Judah and Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 502.

In other words, it was a very persuasive means with which to convince an intended audience of the truth value of the discourse.

Comparably, ancient Near Eastern rulers commonly used existing discursive patterns and attempted to (re)present themselves, as means of authentication within a certain tradition, as a legitimate successor or a "restorer of order";[62] for instance, the Cyrus Cylinder (re)presents Cyrus as another Aššurbanipal and restorer of order of Babylon, a pattern which will be discussed below. Furthermore, Akkadian historical epics, which are "poetic narratives concerned with the activities of kings," combine epic narrative patterns with external referents. Grayson states that "[i]n contrast to other epics the events described are essentially historical rather than mythological."[63] Akkadian historical epics appear to be evidence for the use of metanarrative structures and patterns in Mesopotamian discourses.

Greek historiography also made use of previously established metanarratives. Hartog posits that Herodotus' narrative of the Persian Wars was patterned on elements of the Homer's Trojan War, albeit for his own ends in a completely different socio-historical context.[64] Additionally, Rood suggests that Thucydides account of the Athenian invasion of Sicily "… is in some ways a re-run…" of Herodotus' account of the Persian invasion of Greece.[65] If this is indeed the case, similar metanarrative structures may have been used by Homer,

---

[62] The "restorer of order" *topos* will be explored at length in Chapter 5.

[63] A.K. Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts* (Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 7.

[64] Francois Hartog, "The Invention of History: The Pre-History of a Concept from Homer to Herodotus," *History and Theory* 39 (October 2000), 389.

[65] Tim Rood, "Thucydides' Persian Wars," in C. Shuttleworth Kraus (ed.), *Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 159.

Herodotus, and Thucydides. Referring to the Atys/Adratus episode, Chiasson argues that

> … Herodotus is not concerned… with the contrast between historical accuracy and poetic fiction. On the contrary: he knowingly chooses to fashion his narrative after a literary model familiar to his audience—one that would engage their emotions and guide their understanding of the story, as well as create generic expectations he pointedly exceeds in the stunning finale, marked by the hand of the *histor*.[66]

Thus, use of pre-established metanarrative patterns, which may cross genres of discourse, seems to be an intercultural phenomenon that creates ambiguity between history and fiction.

According to some scholars, a fine line, if one even exists, separates historical narratives from fictional narratives. For instance, Todorov contends that "[o]ne does not construct 'fiction' differently from 'reality.' The historian who studies written documents or the judge who depends upon oral testimony both reconstitute the 'facts,' and their procedures are in principle no different from those of the reader of *Armance*".[67] Sternberg maintains that "…what makes fictional and breaks historical writing is not the presence of invented material—inevitable in both—but the privilege and at will the flaunting of re-invention."[68] Mink has argued that "[h]istory *does* not as such differ from fiction, therefore, insofar as it essentially depends on and develops our skill and subtlety in following stories."[69] Anchor posits that the significant difference between the historian and the novelist is "… not that one explains experience and the other doesn't; both explain experience, but in different ways: the historian, by representing it as real, and the novelist, by representing it as imaginable. The difference between history and literature, in other words, is cultural rather than cognitive."[70]

---

[66] Charles C. Chiasson, "Herodotus' Use of Attic Tragedy in the Lydian *Logos*," *Classical Antiquity* 22.1 (2003), 18-19.

[67] Tzvetan Todorov, *Genres in Discourse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 48.

[68] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985), 29.

[69] Louis O. Mink, "History and Fiction as Modes of Comprehension," *New Literary History* 1.3 (1970), 545.

Bal defines a narrative text as one "… in which an agent relates ('tells') a story in a particular medium, such as language, imagery, sound, buildings, or a combination thereof." Historical narratives, like fictional narratives, are stories with a fabula (i.e., "a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors"), a narrator, actors, and events.[71] As in fictional narratives, sequential events in historical narratives are linked together through emplotment, which creates didactic stories with a beginning, middle, and conclusion. In other words, the event is connected to the narrative through the plot,[72] and in Veyne's view, "… the fact is nothing without its plot."[73] Plot may be defined loosely as "… the logic and dynamic of narrative, and narrative itself a form of understanding and explanation." Plot is then the outline of the story, or "that which supports and organizes the rest."[74] Anchor points out that plot forms disparate events into a "meaningful totality", and that the plot is provided by the narrator, and not by the scattered events that are selected, described, and arranged into a meaningful totality. Furthermore, Anchor contends that although a narrator must show that things could have turned out differently, she or he must make her or his conclusions about the outcome of events plausible through emplotting the sequential events.[75]

---

[70] Anchor, "Narrativity," 126.

[71] Bal, *Narratology*, 5.

[72] Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative* (2 vols; Trans. K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), I, 207.

[73] Veyne, *Writing History*, 33.

[74] Peter Brooks, "Reading for the Plot," in *Narratology: An Introduction*, 254.

The external referential point of a past event, regardless of its historicity, in my view, distinguishes historical narratives from fictional narratives. For Ricoeur, history "… remains historical to the extent that all of its objects refer back to first-order entities—peoples, nations, civilizations—that bear the indelible mark of concrete agents' participatory belonging to the sphere of praxis and narrative." These first-order entities act as transitional objects "… between all the artifacts produced by history and the characters of a possible narrative."[76] It is important to emphasize once again that the external referential point needs only to be accepted as true by the author(s) and the intended audience, a point which negates the relevance of the historicity of the referent. Perhaps this is why Anchor suggests that historical is distinguishable from other narrative types in that "it claims to be true."[77] Rüsen maintains that historical discourses "… present the past in the form of a chronological order of events which are presented as 'factual,' that is, with a special quality of experience."[78]

Although both historical and fictional narratives are emplotted stories and may share some basic patterns, external referents that are presented as true, and are accepted as such by the author and intended audience, separate the historian from the fictional storyteller, who depends on internal referents created in her/his own mind. Mink has stated that "[h]istory *does* of course differ from fiction insofar as it is obligated to rest upon evidence of occurrence in real space and time of what it describes and insofar as it must grow out of critical assessment of the received materials of history, including the analyses and interpretation of other historians."[79] White describes the difference between historian and fictional writer as follows:

---

[75] Anchor, "Narrativity," 124.
[76] Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, I, 181.
[77] Anchor, "Narrativity," 125.
[78] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches,"14.

> It is sometimes said that the aim of the historian is to explain the past by "finding," "identifying," or "uncovering," the "stories" that lie buried in chronicles; and that the difference between "history" and "fiction" resides in the fact that the historian "finds" his stories, whereas the fiction writer "invents" his. This conception of the historian's task, however, obscures the extent to which "invention" also plays a part in the historian's operations.[80]

Thus, truth claim and external referent seem to be what distinguishes the historian from the fictional writer.

In regards to a past event, or social memory of an event, as an external referent, White points out that "[t]he same event can serve as a different kind of element of many different historical stories, depending on the role it is assigned in a specific motific characterization of the set to which it belongs."[81] In other words, the same events can be emplotted differently in different discourses,[82] and "… data belonging to heterogeneous categories—social, political, religious—can compose one and the same event; it is even very frequently the case."[83] Different historical narratives may be created from the same external referent, and all of them are historical because of their claims to truth and their common referentiality, regardless of its historicity. For instance, both Herodotus and the Cyrus Cylinder provide an account of Cyrus the Great's conquest of Babylon.

---

[79] Mink, "History and Fiction," 545.

[80] Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 6-7.

[81] White, *Metahistory*, 7. See also White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 85.

[82] See Anchor, "Narrativity," 124.

[83] Veyne, *Writing History*, 35.

In the *Histories*, Cyrus' epic battle against the river is, not surprisingly, greater than his battle against the city of Babylon itself, as throughout the *Histories*, Herodotus puts the Persians into conflict with nature, which includes undoing natural order and creating imbalance. For example, Xerxes lashes the Hellespont (7.35) and his army drinks a river dry (7.196), both incidents constituting acts of Persian *hybris*. Moreover, crossing a body of water may constitute an act of *hybris* in the *Histories*, since a natural land bridge would be present if the gods actually wanted people to have access to the other side.[84] Thus, Herodotus introduces the reader to what will recur later in the narrative during his account of the Persian Wars.

Composed in a very different social world and presenting a very different ideological end to the intended readership, the Cyrus Cylinder is of course a classic example of Persian propaganda, or perhaps better, ancient Near Eastern propaganda, since it clearly used Near Eastern conventions and tried to present Cyrus as another Aššurbanipal and a "restorer of order" for Babylon.[85]

Similarly, Ben Zvi examines the external referent of Sennacherib's campaign against Jerusalem during the reign of Hezekiah, an event which Ben Zvi considers a core fact, in an Assyrian annalistic account, the books of Kings and Chronicles in the Hebrew Bible, and Josephus' *Antiquities*.[86] Ben Zvi concludes that these divergent accounts "... are positive proof that ancient constructions of Sennacherib's campaign against Judah were highly malleable. In other words, ancient writers could mold their account of the campaign to serve particular theological, ideological, literary and rhetorical purposes, as required by their own situation."[87]

---

[84] Henry R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Philological Monographs 23; Cleveland, OH: Press of Western Reserve University, 1966), 293.

[85] See Amelie Kuhrt, "The Cyrus Cylinder and Achaemenid Policy," *JSOT* 25 (1983), 83-97.

[86] See Ben Zvi, "Malleability and its Limits," 73-103.

Divergent narratives based on similar referentiality emerged not only in different cultures and literary traditions but also circulated among the same public, as was the case in Persian Yehud. Chronicles obviously used the books of Samuel and Kings, or their sources, as sources and copied them verbatim in many instances. However, source material was also reworked in Chronicles, and this led to the formation of new and unique narratives based on the same referentiality. Of course, Chronicles had to maintain the core facts accepted by its intended audience, including David's greatness, Solomon's building of the temple, Sennacherib's failed campaign against Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem and the subsequent exile, and the list of kings and the length of their reigns. Aside from these limitations, a unique discourse could be built on the foundation of core facts accepted by ancient Israelite communities to propagate a prevailing ideology in the world of the author and the readership.[88] Interestingly, making a point similar to that of Ben Zvi, Rüsen refers to historiography as "... an elaborated presentation of the past bound into the medium of *writing* with its possibilities and limits."[89]

Chronicles could idealize and retell the discourses on the United Monarchy or have Manasseh repent, both of which were accepted by the community as true, but could not have Asa build the temple or Manasseh reign for less than fifty-five years, since the latter two would have been rejected by the community as false—such a representation would have been a deviation from accepted core facts.[90] Because of its divergence from its sources, Chronicles' value as historiography should not be diminished, nor should Chronicles be viewed as historiographically inferior to Samuel or Kings. Such views have led some scholars to question if Chronicles is history in the same sense as Samuel and Kings. In addition to a history unto itself, Chronicles has been considered a supplement to Samuel and Kings, a midrash, and an exegesis.[91]

---

[87] Ben Zvi, "Malleability and its Limits," 89.
[88] See Ben Zvi, "General Observations;" *idem*, "Malleability and its Limits".
[89] Rüsen, "Some Theoretical Approaches,"14.

Should we rank ancient historiography based on apparent historicity? Is Herodotus' account of Cyrus' conquest superior to that found in the Cyrus Cylinder? Does Kings provide a better account of monarchic Israel than Chronicles? It is not my goal to look for historicity in these texts in order to try to establish which, if either, text/tradition better represents an "actual" event. What divergent accounts reveal is the ideological and rhetorical apparatus of an author or a tradition. In Ricoeur's words:

> We must therefore admit that two rival interpretations account for different facts, the same events being placed according to the perspective of the different terminal consequences. Either interpretation can be objective and true with regard to the causal sequences upon which it is elaborated. *We do not rewrite the same history, we write another history.*[92]

Thus, Chronicles probably should not be thought of as a "rewrite" of Samuel-Kings but rather as writing of another history, its own history using the same core facts as external referents. We have little reason to view Chronicles as a second rate history to Samuel-Kings. Similarly, we have little reason to view Near Eastern historical narratives such as the Cyrus Cylinder as inferior to the Classical tradition. Re-creation of the past using an external referent is contingent upon genre, which is contingent upon the society and is negotiated between author(s) and audience. Different constructions of genres of history existed throughout the ancient world, and no genre of history should be privileged above others. Therefore, an analysis of ancient historiography begins with an analysis of genre.

---

[90] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."

[91] See Isaac Kalimi, "Was the Chronicler a Historian?" in M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund, and S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *Chronicler as Historian* (JSOTSup 238; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 73-89.

[92] Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, I, 119. My emphasis.

Todorov explains that "[i]n a given society, the recurrence of certain discursive properties is institutionalized, and individual texts are produced and perceived in relation to the norm constituted by that codification." In Todorov's view, a genre "… is nothing other than the codification of discursive properties." Moreover, "[i]t is because genres exist as an institution that they function as 'horizons of expectations' for readers and as 'models of writing' for authors."[93] According to Barthes, ""… the 'author' is not the person who invents the finest stories but the person who best masters the code which is practiced equally by his listeners… its rules so binding, that it is difficult to conceive a 'tale' devoid of the coded signs of narrative…."[94] Through their institutionalization, genres indirectly communicate with the society in which they operate, and like other institutions, genres may illuminate the "constitutive features" (i.e., ideologies, social centres) of that society. Furthermore, a society selects and codifies the actions and events that are most closely associated with its prevailing ideologies. For Todorov, this is "… why the existence of certain genres in one society, their absence in another, are revelatory of that ideology and allow us to establish it more or less confidently."[95] As Todorov points out, different societies construct different genres. Thus, genre analysis is cultural analysis, since genres are not universal but rather, culturally and temporally contingent.

---

[93] Todorov, *Genres in Discourse*, 17-18.
[94] Barthes, "Structural Analysis of Narratives," 58.

Even if different societies share a genre (i.e., history), the genre too is culturally contingent, which results in unique discourses. Once again, uniqueness results from author-readership negotiations. Additionally, a text has to fulfill the genre expectations of an intended audience for it to be accepted.[96] According to Ricoeur, "[h]istorians address themselves to distrustful readers who expect from them not only that they narrate but that they authenticate their narrative."[97] Similarly, Sternberg believes that genre "… boils down to the rules of the writing game, namely to the premises, conventions, and undertakings that attach to the discourse as an affair between writer and audience."[98] Genre then is negotiated between author and readership, and diverse traditions, cultures, and communities produce unique authors and readers influenced by cultural ideologies and institutions. In Ben Zvi's words, "[g]enre has to do with the expectations and ideological horizons of a particular readership, which of course, may and do change from readership to readership, and are in any case social and historical dependent… This being so, that which is considered to be 'history' by one group may not be considered so by another."[99] As discussed above, annals and chronicles become history through emplotment or "imaginable gap-filling" such as causal connections and personal motivations, all of which is acceptable "… as long as it operates within the limits of whatever counts as the rules of evidence."[100] These rules of evidence are culturally and temporally contingent.

---

[95] Todorov, *Genres in Discourse*, 19.
[96] See Ben Zvi, "General Observations."
[97] Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, I, 176.
[98] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 26.
[99] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."

As such, a Persian Jerusalem authorship and readership could not be expected to create rules to historical discourses similar to those found in Athens or Babylon. Claims that the origins of "history" lie in either sixth century BCE Israel or fifth century BCE Athens, both of which preclude the possibility of its existence in Mesopotamia, seem to be a result of imposing modern genres on the ancient world. To some modern readers, the rules of historical discourse negotiated by Thucydides and his readership more closely resemble our own than do those negotiated by Babylonian scribes and their readership. Mesopotamia obviously will appear to lack historical writing if we are looking for evidence of an ancient Israelite, ancient Greek, or modern genre of history. A tradition's historical narratives should be evaluated by its own genre of historical discourse rather than purporting that a tradition fails to meet the requirements of some universal genre of history.

1.4 Definitions of History in the Hebrew Bible

Halpern's thesis is that the intention of the author distinguishes historical from other forms of writing. He argues that "… some of those authors—those who wrote works recognizably historical—had authentic antiquarian intentions. They meant to furnish fair and accurate representations of Israelite antiquity."[101] Both aspects of Halpern's contention are problematic. First, the intention of the author cannot be known, particularly when texts are over 2 000 years old and have no identifiable author(s). In short, conjecture about an author's intent tells us virtually nothing about ancient Israelite historiography. A narrative may provide some insights into the intended audience, or the narratee, but nothing about an author's intention. The Hebrew Bible does not have identifiable authors but does have narrators and narratees, since the narrator must be addressing someone. Prince points out that "[e]very author, provided he is writing for someone other than himself, develops his narrative as a function of a certain type of reader whom he bestows with certain qualities, faculties, and inclinations…."[102] The intended audiences of biblical discourses are "zero-degree" narratees, since they know the tongue and languages of the narrators, and to know the tongue of the narrator is to know the meanings, the signifieds, and the referents. Therefore, since a series of signals are directed to the narratee, a portrait of the narratee emerges from the narrative addressed to her/him/them.[103]

---

[100] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 29.

[101] Baruch Halpern, *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 3.

Second, for reasons outlined throughout this thesis, my view is that ancient Israelite historical writings are comprised of social memories (i.e., referents accepted by the author(s) and the intended audience) and purported to be true, a concept which is different from an author intending to provide a fair and accurate representation of Israelite antiquity. I contend that Halpern imposed a modern genre of historical writing (i.e., positivist genre construction) on ancient discourses.

---

[102] Gerald Prince, "Introduction to the Study of the Narratee," *Narratology: An Introduction,* 191.
[103] Prince, "Introduction to the Study of the Narratee," 194.

The views of Van Seters are also problematic because of genre imposition. Van Seters outlines five criteria for historical writing in ancient Israel:

> 1. History writing is a specific form of tradition in its own right. Any explanation of the genre as merely the accidental accumulation of traditional material is inadequate.
> 2. History writing is not primarily the accurate reporting of past events. It also considers the reasons for recalling the past and the significance given to past events.
> 3. History writing examines the causes of present conditions and circumstances. In antiquity these causes were primarily moral—who is responsible for a certain state of affairs? …
> 4. History writing is national or corporate in character. Therefore, merely reporting the deeds of the king may be only biographical unless they are viewed as part of the national history.
> 5. History writing is part of the literary tradition and plays a significant role in the corporate traditions of the people.[104]

My points of contestation with Van Seters primarily deal with points 4 and 5. As outlined in the Introduction, the contention that "history writing is national or corporate in character" is problematic in that Van Seters uses this criterion as a means to an end, namely to prove his thesis that the first instance of historical writing occurred in sixth century BCE Israel: "Nevertheless, I hope I have demonstrated that the first Israelite historian, and the first known historian in Western civilization truly to deserve this designation, was the Deuteronomistic historian."[105] This sort of exclusionist criterion precludes the possibility of historical writing occurring in Mesopotamia, Egypt, or Hatti Land, a conclusion I do not accept. Van Seters has invented a genre of historical writing and has attempted to impose it universally across the ancient world. I think that Van Seters has not considered the temporal and spatial contingency (i.e., cultural contingency) of genre carefully enough. In my view, Van Seter's neglect of the nuances of genre undermines the possible acceptance of his criteria. This sort of criteria does not work well in an intercultural analysis.

---

[104] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 4-5.
[105] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 362.

Further, Van Seter's insistence on the corporate nature of historical writing is not even applicable to all instances of historical writing in the Hebrew Bible. Ben Zvi has pointed out that "… biographical narratives are implicitly or explicitly part of a national history."[106] For instance, narratives about central characters such as David are both biographical and part of a national/corporate historical discourse, and therefore, the two should not be seen as mutually exclusive. In sum, I agree with Ben Zvi that Van Seter's approach "… is not heuristically helpful to distinguish between historical and non-historical writings in the HB, because there is no 'biography' there that is not associated with a national narrative."[107]

Finally, Brettler defines historical writing in the Hebrew Bible as "a narrative that presents a past." Brettler adds that "[t]he group of 'narratives' that present a past' delimits a meaningful corpus of biblical texts which may be distinguished from other corpora, such as law, proverbs, psalms and (most of) prophecy."[108] Brettler's definition is on the right track but fails to account for some important nuances. In a review of *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel,* Amit challenges Brettler's contention of history being "a narrative that presents the past" by inquiring about the biblical poetry that presents a past. Amit asks: "Is Psalm 78 less history than the story of the Exodus only because of its genre? If history is a specific genre, what is the place of the different genres one can find in the historical books?"[109] Amit brings up some very important issues. In fact, I would ask the same about Psalm 78 and the Book of Exodus. Also, what about the Psalm of Thanksgiving in 1 Chron. 16:8-36? Is the psalm not historical writing, even though it is in the Chronicles, because it is not a narrative proper? How does one view parts of the Book of Jeremiah dealing with the Babylonian conquest?

---

[106] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."
[107] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."
[108] Brettler, *Creation of History in Ancient Israel,* 12.

Although narrative form is the most common form of historical discourse in the Hebrew Bible, does it preclude other forms of discourse? I agree with Ben Zvi when he states that "… not only were the boundaries of the genre of 'history' as understood by the Jerusalem literati far more porous than usually assumed, but also 'historical-narrative' becomes a subgenre of 'history writing,' even if it is undoubtedly the most common."[110] In sum, Brettler's, as well as Van Seter's, insistence on the narrative form of historical discourse probably should be revisited, since in ancient Israel and elsewhere, narrative is only one way to present a discourse on the past.

---

[109] Yairah Amit, Review of Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*, *Review of Biblical Literature* [http://www.bookreviews.org] (2000).
[110] Ben Zvi, "General Observations."

2. Narrative, Didacticism, and Divine Providence in Chronicles, Mesopotamian Historiography, and Greek Historiography

2.1 Chronicles

2.1.1 NARRATIVE AND DIDACTICISM. Duke suggests that "… the general rhetorical functions of the genre 'historical narrative' in the Hebrew Bible are: (1) to preserve the traditions, and consequently shape the identity, of Israel; (2) to respond to the needs and questions of the intended audience in their given situation; and (3) to present and inculcate a worldview, a description of how the world operates."[1]

Duke also argues that one of the primary purposes of Chronicles was to compel the intended audience "… to seek Yahweh through the proper forms of the Jerusalem cult." Chronicles emphasized to its intended audience the importance of the institutions of the Jerusalem cult and the Davidic dynasty, in addition to the view that YHWH, who was an active agent in historical events, rewarded and punished acts relating to the two aforementioned institutions.[2] Thus, Jerusalem and the Jerusalem cult comprise the core social system (i.e., the social centre) around which the narrative in Chronicles is formed.

Chronicles employed a fourth century BCE Persian Yehud social centre to instill the social memory of the monarchic period with didactic or moral significance to its contemporary intended audience. The centrality and sacredness of Jerusalem and its cult functioned as the social centre at the core of the narrative in Chronicles. In other words, Judah's struggles and conflicts with the North and other adversaries, including its triumphs, which were seen as divine blessing and favour, were interpreted and presented through the scope of a social centre and its governing laws. Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 1, Pocock argues that awareness of the past is a social awareness that exists as part of an awareness of the structure and behaviour of a society, and since societies are structured around self-preservation, the function of narratives about the past is to ensure the continuity of communities and their institutions. Chronicles tried to ensure the continuity and preservation of Persian Yehud institutions and cultic traditions by authenticating them through narratives about the past. Duke points out that Chronicles' "seeking YHWH" paradigm "… explained the exile and return from exile. Moreover, it provided the people with an identity that connected them to the promise of God and institutions of their past. It focused and guided their present actions. It gave them reason to hope for a better future."[3] This being said, it should be noted that although Chronicles may have given its intended audience reason to hope for a better future, "… the book is much more about how to live in the present of the community of readers than about messianic fervor or the circumstances that will exist in a far and undefined future to be brought about by YHWH whenever the deity wishes to do so."[4]

---

[1] Rodney K. Duke, "A Rhetorical Approach to Appreciating the Books of Chronicles," in M.P. Graham and S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Textuality* (JSOTSup 263; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 113.

[2] Duke, "A Rhetorical Approach," 115-16.

Chronicles' Persian Yehud socio-historical context was temple-centered and kingless, that is, without a Davidic king. Thus, using lessons from the past, Chronicles explained to its intended audience how present circumstance came to be, and its explanation for the community's present situation is laden with didactic elements which the intended audience was to apply to its contemporary world. Throughout Chronicles the principle of seeking YHWH is emphasized. Those communities, or generations, who sought YHWH prospered, while those who did not seek YHWH were abandoned and punished. However, in regards to individual and immediate retribution, Ben Zvi is correct when he states that

---

[3] Duke, "A Rhetorical Approach," 118.

[4] Ehud Ben Zvi, "A House of Treasures: The Account of Amaziah in 2 Chronicles 25—Observations and Implications," *Forthcoming*, 18.

> .... the Chronicler did not claim or wish the audience to understand reported attestations of certain theological principles as proof that such principles are universally or absolutely valid. Rather than presenting to the audience a world governed by God according to a set of independent principles, whose relative importance may be abstracted from the number of reported attestations, Chronicles suggested to its historical audience a world in which God's principles are deeply interrelated and qualify each other, and therefore, a world in which God's rules cause a variety of possible effects, including those which are inconsistent with some of the divine principles themselves, had they been separate and universally valid. This multiplicity of possible results *allowed* relatively flexible explanations of events in Israel's construction of the past, and the lives of the audience as well.[5]

Additionally, a mechanical model of retribution would have implied that humans can completely understand and predict YHWH's mind and actions, an implication that could be viewed as an act of *hybris*.[6]

Chronicles' flexible retributive model instructed its intended audience that in many cases individuals are rewarded and punished for their individual acts, but in other cases YHWH tests the pious (1 Chronicles 21; 2 Chron. 14:8-14; 16:1-7; 20:1-30; 32:1-21), rewards individuals for no apparent reason (1 Chron. 22:9-10; 28:5-7; 29:1), and punishes the innocent (1 Chronicles 21; 2 Chron. 16:10; 24:21). Chronicles also emphasized the collective actions of a nation, as the cumulative sins of the nation led to the ultimate catastrophe, or dystopia, which was the destruction of the temple. Thus, in Chronicles, it was the responsibility of both individuals from the community and the collective community to seek YHWH.

---

[5] Ehud Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Theology of the Chronicler," *SJOT* 9.1 (1995), 37-38.

[6] See Ehud Ben Zvi, "Analogical Thinking and Ancient Israelite Intellectual History: The Case for an 'Entropy Model' in the Study of Israelite Thought," in T.J. Sandoval and C. Mandolfo (eds.), *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible* (JSOTSup 384; London and New York: T & T Clark International, 2003), 326.

Through the presentation of the combined reigns of David and Solomon, Chronicles presents an idealized period in which divinely elected, pious kings together build the temple. During Solomon's reign, a united Israel enjoys a time of peace and great prosperity. It is in his depiction of Israel's "golden age" that Chronicles associates YHWH, the Davidic kings, Jerusalem, and the temple. In Chronicles, the only legitimate kings of Israel are the Davidic descendants who rule YHWH's kingdom from his divinely elected city, Jerusalem, which is the only centre for proper YHWHistic worship. Kingship of the Davidic dynasty is partially transferable[7] but divine election of Jerusalem is unconditional and eternal. This is evident in 2 Chronicles 36 when kingship is transferred to Cyrus while Jerusalem maintains its core position in the discourse. The conditional nature of the ruling of the Davidic dynasty and the eternity of Jerusalem corresponded to Chronicles' socio-historical setting: in Persian Yehud, the community was without a Davidic king but Jerusalem was still the elected city of God (i.e., home of YHWH and his temple).

Finally, Chronicles taught its intended audience lessons pertaining to the relationship between Jerusalem's sacred space and Shechem's profane space, in addition to lessons about the schism of the two kingdoms. Furthermore, Chronicles instructed its community that the only legitimate kings were those of the Davidic dynasty. However, Chronicles also instructed its intended audience that all of Israel are the people of God.

---

[7] I say partially transferable because although kingship is transferred to Cyrus, Cyrus does not achieve the same status as a Davidic king. As argued by Ben Zvi, "... the emphasis on the Davidic line and their kingship in Jerusalem, among others, precludes a full transference of their roles in the divine economy to an Achaemenid king such as Cyrus..." (Ben Zvi, "A House of Treasures," 18).

2.1.2 DIVINE PROVIDENCE. It is generally agreed that divine providence[8] is a central component to Chronicles' historiographical apparatus. Japhet states that within the Hebrew Bible "[a] belief in reward and punishment signifies an assurance that God requites the deeds, good and bad, of human beings and stems from a conviction of divine providence."[9] According to Japhet, both Kings and Chronicles are works of theodicy; that is, they both attribute a terrible human fate to human deeds so that a just God is acquitted of responsibility for that fate.[10] Chronicles presents both good and evil in terms of divine justice, as divine reward and divine retribution. Japhet suggests that Chronicles' method of reworking its sources "… is evident in its … interpretation of every historical event in terms of reward and punishment and in his explanation of good as well as evil."[11] Furthermore, the aim in both Kings and Chronicles "… is to prove that God acts in history according to the principle of divine justice."[12] In sum, the foundation of Chronicles is its theological system, which is, for the most part, based on a model of retribution and reward.

---

[8] Ben Zvi states that the term "retribution" has an exclusively negative connotation, and therefore limits the scope of Chronicles' theological position. Ben Zvi prefers the "actions and effects regulated by God." See Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion," 38. I agree with Ben Zvi that the term "retribution" is rather one-dimensional and limited, and therefore choose instead to use divine providence, which includes both reward and punishment.

[9] Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in the Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ 9; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997), 151.

[10] I think that 2 Chron. 10:15 is a counterexample to the above statement. Chronicles' omission of the events of 1 Kgs 11:1-40 completely augments the narrative. Kings, like Chronicles, positively depicts Solomon in 1 Kings 2-10, but also provides an account of Solomon's apostasy in his old age (1 Kgs 11:1-40). In Kings, the account of Solomon's apostasy and idolatry is explanatory, for it is the primary reason for the divided kingdoms. Knoppers states that "[i]n the Deuteronomist's elaborate schematization of history, the events and divisions are not haphazard or unexpected; they constitute both the deity's appointed retribution against Solomon and the divinely authorized grounds for a new kingdom of the northern tribes over which Jeroboam is to be king" (Gary Knoppers, "Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?" *JBL* 109.3 [1990], 428). In 1 Kgs 11:11-12, YHWH informs Solomon that his kingdom will be torn away and given to his servant (Jeroboam), but, because of David, this will not occur in Solomon's days; rather it will happen in the days of Solomon's son, Rehoboam. Chronicles' exclusion of Solomon's apostasy does not explain adequately why the kingdom disintegrates under Rehoboam, and thus negates the legitimacy of Jeroboam's reign. So, if not Solomon's apostasy, to what does Chronicles attribute the schism in the united monarchy? 2 Chron. 10:15 reveals a divine cause for the secession in the united monarchy and Israel's golden age. The reader is informed, "… for a turn of affairs connected with God had happened so that YHWH could fulfill the word that he had spoken through Ahijah the Shilonite to Jeroboam ben Nebat" (2 Chron. 10:15). Thus, Rehoboam hardly can be blamed for the schism in the united monarchy.

Kelly briefly delineates the prominence of divine reward and retribution in Chronicles:

> A concern with Yahweh's activity of rewarding and punishing pervades the work. This is most evident in the post-Solomonic narrative of 2 Chronicles 10-36, which is structured explicitly around this theme, but the perspective is also reflected in the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9 and is an important concern throughout the narratives of Saul (1 Chron. 10), David (1 Chron. 11-29), and Solomon (2 Chron. 1-9). It may be added that the different forms reflected in the book, such as prophetic and royal speech, prayer and authorial comment, all have divine reward and punishment as a recurrent and often dominant theme.[13]

Moreover, "[i]t is evident from even a cursory reading of the book, especially 2 Chronicles 10-36, that the author does affirm a strong link between obedience and blessing, and disobedience and punishment, within the lifetimes of individuals and generations."[14] Although Chronicles does not differ greatly from other Hebrew Bible books in this manner, it is "… certainly distinguished by the frequency of this theme and the manner of its treatment."[15]

Chronicles measures the success and failures of each successive king and generation in terms of a condition to which all Davidic monarchs must adhere (1

---

[11] Japhet, *Ideology*, 153-56.
[12] Japhet, *Ideology*, 156.
[13] Brian E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (JSOTSup 211; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 48-49.
[14] Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology*, 29.
[15] Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology*, 30.

Chron. 17:3-15).[16] The fulfillment of this condition is the responsibility of the king, and therefore, the king must seek YHWH so that the kingdom may flourish, but in instances in which the king fails to seek YHWH, the kingdom is abandoned by YHWH and fails to prosper; in cases of the latter, divine retribution most often ensues when YHWH abandons the king and the people. In the world of the text, it is more likely for a king who acts piously during the beginning of a reign to reject YHWH and eventually be punished (Asa, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and to a lesser degree Josiah are all examples) than it is for a king who acts impiously at the advent of a reign to seek YHWH and be rewarded. The obvious exception to the latter scenario is of course Manasseh. In other words, very few kings who initiate periods of piety and prosperity (i.e., blessings) are able to maintain them, but kings who initiate periods of impiety almost always end in the same manner in which they started. In sum, post-Solomonic kings, for the most part, tend to fail in some way.[17]

Pious kings who seek YHWH most often are rewarded with divine blessings, which include peace and rest, multiple children, great building projects, and military success; impious kings, on the other hand, who fail to seek YHWH have neither many children nor building projects and are afflicted with military attacks, military defeats, and illnesses. In addition to explicit references to seeking YHWH, acts such as "doing right in the sight of YHWH", "walking in the ways" of a righteous predecessor, humbling oneself, and preserving the Jerusalem cult also constitute instances of seeking YHWH.[18] The relationship between a king's piety and the success of the kingdom is evident in 1 Chron. 28:9 (cf. 2 Chron. 7:17-22).

---

[16] See Brian E. Kelly, "'Retribution' Revisited: Covenant, Grace and Restoration," in Graham, McKenzie, and Knoppers (eds.), *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein* (JSOTSup 371; New York: T&T Clark International, 2003), 214-18.
[17] Ben Zvi, "A House of Treasures," 9-10.

> And you, Solomon my son, know the god of your father, and serve him with a whole heart and with a willing soul, because YHWH searches all hearts, and understands all intention of thoughts. If you seek him, he will be found, but if you abandon him, he will declare you rejected forever.

However, it is important to mention that prophetic figures provide an opportunity for impious kings to repent and seek YHWH. In fact, Japhet suggests that "warning before punishment" is mandatory in Chronicles.[19] Furthermore, ignoring a prophetic warning seems to constitute an act of not seeking YHWH, as even the pious Josiah is punished for not heeding a prophetic message from Pharaoh Neco.[20] Thus, even the most pious of kings are subject to divine retribution when prophetic words go unheeded. In sum, in cases in which a king does not seek YHWH, or a king fails to repent and/or heed a prophetic warning, divine retribution ensues.

Significantly, as illustrated by Ben Zvi, Chronicles implies that during each individual reign, the king is so influential that the behavior of his subjects, which includes both elite and common people, closely follows that of the king, and therefore, the fate of the kingdom and the behavior and fate of the people as individuals is contingent upon his behaviour.[21]

---

[18] Duke, "A Rhetorical Approach," 120-22.

[19] Japhet, *Ideology*, 176-91; *idem, I & II Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 44-45.

[20] Josiah seeks YHWH (2 Chron. 34:3), makes cultic reforms (vv. 3-7), and repairs the temple (vv. 8-13). Furthermore, the book of the law is discovered during his reign (vv. 14-21) and Huldah prophesies that because Josiah humbled himself before YHWH, his eyes will not have to witness the destruction of Jerusalem (that is, he will go to his grave in peace) (vv. 22-28). Additionally, Josiah renews the covenant (vv. 29-33) and celebrates the Passover (vv. 35:1-19). Despite Josiah's great piety, he still ignores the warnings of prophetic speech and is punished by divine retribution. Immediately after Chronicles states that the Passover was celebrated (35:19), Pharaoh Neco appears in the narrative to make war on Charchemish and Josiah goes out to engage him (v. 20). Pharaoh Neco sends messengers to Josiah asking what business they have with each other; he informs Josiah that Egypt is not at war with Judah and that he is under orders from YHWH to battle the house with which he is at war. Most importantly, Neco warns Josiah to stop interfering will God's will so that the Judahite king is not destroyed by divine retribution (v. 21). However, Josiah fails to heed the prophetic words of Neco, which come from the mouth of God and consequently, he is killed when he disguises himself in order to make war with Egypt (vv. 22-24).

> On the one hand, the kingdom flourishes under good kings—because they are successful kings—and dwindles under the bad ones—because they are unsuccessful kings. On the other hand, a prosperous kingdom goes together with an elite and 'people' who behave according to YHWH's will, and conversely an ebbing kingdom, with an elite and 'people' who do not seek God. Thus, in so far as the Chronicler is consistent with these propositions, this writer is able to present to his/her audience just two types of monarchical societies. The first one consists of a wrongdoing king, elite and people, and the second of a righteous king, elite and people.[22]

However, the above statements do not preclude the existence of pious individuals during the reigns of impious kings. Prophetic figures are examples of pious individuals who admonish and warn impious kings and people. The reign of Rehoboam is an example in which a pious individual, namely Shemaiah the prophet, admonishes the king and the people to repent, and once the warning is heeded, the kingdom begins to flourish (2 Chron. 12:5-14). But as is evident in the case of Rehoboam, it is the king who must repent in order for the kingdom to flourish, because, once again, the piety or impiety of the kingdom (i.e., the people) is contingent upon the behaviour and decisions of the king.[23]

Chronicles illustrates sudden changes of heart in the elite and the people that occur immediately following the death of an impious king. Before an impious king is buried, the elite and the people acknowledge that the king did not seek YHWH, and as a result of his impiety, he is not given a royal burial with the other more pious Davidic kings. Thus, Chronicles exhibits that with the cessation of an impious king, the Israelites, once again, follow God's ways and seek YHWH. For instance, when the pious Hezekiah replaces Ahaz, who is for Chronicles the most impious of the Davidic kings, the elite and the people change their impious ways.[24]

---

[21] Ehud Ben Zvi, "A Gateway to the Chronicler's Teaching: The Account of the Reign of Ahaz in 2 Chr 28:1-7," *SJOT* 7.2 (1993), 232.
[22] Ben Zvi, "Gateway," 232-33.
[23] See Ben Zvi, "Gateway," 233 (footnote 41); Japhet, *Ideology*, 176-91.

2.1.3 SUMMARY: In sum, divine providence was an integral component for Chronicles' didactic apparatus. Both events of the past and the intended audience's contemporary social world were explained by YHWH's reaction to human acts. Chronicles' intended audience was taught that if people behave piously, YHWH most often rewarded them, but if people act impiously, they most often were punished. Thus, Chronicles taught its intended audience that the success of a community was contingent upon pious acts, namely proper cultic behaviour (i.e., seeking YHWH).

2.2 Babylonian Historical Narratives

2.2.1 NARRATIVE AND DIDACTICISM. The social centre in Babylonian historical narratives is evident, and like Chronicles, it includes a deity and its city and its cult; Marduk, Babylon, and Esagil form the social centre of Babylonian historical narratives. A common motive for the production of Babylonian historiography was the use of the past for propagandistic or didactic purposes.[25] Babylonian historical narratives were composed to teach lessons about the supremacy of Marduk and Babylon: any king who mistreats Babylon and its people or Marduk and his cult will be unsuccessful. In these texts, the ideal state of affairs included a long lasting, stable nation in which a pious king rules justly and acknowledges the supremacy of Marduk and Babylon.

---

[24] Ben Zvi, "Gateway," 233-34.

[25] Grayson, "Assyria and Babylonia," 189.

Mesopotamian historical discourses instructed intended audiences that the gods governed the world as they rewarded or punished kings for their behaviour while a cosmic law controlled the cyclical regularity of time. "The rise and fall of a dynasty were signs revealing concealed resemblances and were called forth to reproduce themselves."[26] The uncertainty for kings and dynasties is evident in the Sumerian King List: "At divinely appointed times, the dominant city lost this position, and another rose to overall power. In the vision of the Sumerian King List, this continuous rise and fall was determined by a sort of divine lottery, with which there could, of course, be no argument."[27] Moreover, the Sumerian King List "… wished to demonstrate that there could be only one true kingship in Mesopotamia at any one time."[28] However, the important distinction between Babylonian historical narratives and the Sumerian King List is similar to that described in Chronicles above—kingship and dynasties are transferable but the sacred city is eternal. In the Sumerian King List, history is a flow of royal cycles as royal power passes from city to city, "each being in turn the unique repository of an institution that had come down from heaven."[29] In other words, although Mesopotamia is represented throughout the Sumerian King List as having a single divinely elected monarchy and capital, both the monarchy and capital are in a constant state of flux. In contrast, in Babylonian historical narratives, kings may change, but the divinely elected capital of Babylon remains constant.

---

[26] Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 27.
[27] Kuhrt, "Israelite and Near Eastern Historiography," 261.
[28] John Van Seters, "The Historiography of the Ancient Near East," in Jack Sasson (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (4 vols; Peabody Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000), IV, 2439.
[29] Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 56.

Since the best one could expect from life was a long and stable reign by a pious king,[30] ancient Mesopotamians were concerned with the constant demise of dynasties/states, so in order to keep this to a minimum, people, namely the king, had to adopt appropriate behaviour. The cause of the demise of kings and/or dynasties was thought to be human errors, religious faults committed by kings, or the departure of gods. "Whatever the explanation, humanity, to take control of the future, had to learn from the past."[31]

In Babylonian historical narratives, since the arousal of divine anger is caused by a king's impious deeds, which, in most cases, is synonymous with neglect of Marduk's cult, paradigmatic kings such as Sargon and Naram-Sin were used to exhibit appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. Sargon's and Naram-Sin's paradigmatic roles in the Weidner Chronicle exhibit that success accompanies proper cultic behaviour and that misfortune follows cultic negligence, and therefore, it seems likely that the text was "... written as an admonition to future monarchs to pay heed to Babylon and its cult."[32] Thus, the didactic purposes of Babylonian historical narratives are evident.

2.2.2 DIVINE PROVIDENCE. To ancient Mesopotamian scribes, all things were ordered by the gods, who normally announced their intentions in advance. The world of the authors of Babylonian historical narratives revolved around Babylon, Marduk, Esagil, and the Babylonian king. In Babylonian historical narratives, such as the Weidner Chronicle, historical causation is attributed to Marduk, as all explanations follow a similar narrative pattern which suggests: "... that vagaries of human fortune came about through the retributive will of Marduk."[33] Comparable to Chronicles' model of retribution which closely associates the acts of the king and divine providence, Mesopotamian historical discourses rely on a theology of sin and punishment with the impious king being punished by defeat.[34] Marduk, like YHWH, judges the acts of kings and administers justice; Marduk brings prosperity to pious kings and punishes impious kings. This position is evident in the Verse Account of Nabonidus: "[As to Nabonidus] (his) protective deity became hostile to him, [And he, the former favourite of the g]ods (is now) seized by misfortunes: {... against the will of the g]ods he performed an unholy action, [...] he thought out something worthless..." (i).[35]

---

[30] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 3.
[31] Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 27.
[32] Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 43.

Additionally, as in Chronicles, the fate of the nation is contingent upon the good or bad actions of the king. Moreover, once again similar to Chronicles, individual piety of kings in Babylonian historical narratives is contingent upon proper adherence to the cult of the divine sovereign, in this case, Marduk. Thus, the arousal of divine anger is caused by a king's impious deeds, which, in most cases, is synonymous with neglect of Marduk's cult. "Every change in reign was legitimized by relating it to the king's inadequate attention to Marduk's cult."[36] The Weidner Chronicle, Chronicle of Early Kings, Chronicle P, Adad-shumarusar Epic, and Nabopolassar Epic are all examples of texts which propagate this ideology and follow a similar narrative pattern.

---

[33] Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 86.
[34] Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 19.
[35] Translation from James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (2nd edn; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 313.
[36] Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 85.

A. THE WEIDNER CHRONICLE, CHRONICLE OF EARLY KINGS, AND CHRONICLE P.

The Weidner Chronicle narrates events which began as early as the Early Dynastic period of Sumerian history (first half of the third millennium BCE) and came down to as far as the reign of Shulgi (2094-2047 BCE).[37] The text is concerned primarily with the city of Babylon and the god Marduk, and proper cultic behavior in particular. The narrative centres on the provision of fish for Esagil, Marduk's temple, as the author(s) attempt to illustrate that those rulers who neglect or insult Marduk or fail to provide fish offerings for Esagil meet an unfortunate end while those rulers who exhibit proper cultic behaviour toward Marduk and his temple prosper: "… who commits sin against the gods of that city, his star will not *stand* in heaven… *They will not have* a king, his scepter will be taken away, his treasury will become a ruin" (*ABC* 19:27-28).[38] Similar to depictions of kings in biblical historiography, kings are either "good" or "bad" and the transfer of kingship is the direct result of cultic negligence by a king.[39]

---

[37] The date of the text's first composition is unknown but because of its ideological/didactic message, it seems most likely that the text was not written until during or after the time that Marduk became head of the pantheon. Lambert dates Marduk's rise to the head of the pantheon to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I (1126-1105 BCE) (W.G. Lambert, The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion," in W.S. McCullough [ed.], *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964], 3-11). I agree with Glassner that the date of composition can be no earlier than 1100 BCE (*Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 263). This dating system is applicable to any text in which Marduk is the divine sovereign. However, Al-Rawi contends it is possible that the text "… was written after, or at the time of, the taking of Isin by Hammurapi in 1787 (or else of Larsa in 1763) as a form of appeasement towards the newly conquered population…" ("Tablets from the Sippar Library," 1).

[38] By *ABC*, I refer, as traditionally abbreviated, to A.K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000).

[39] Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 43-45; *idem*, "Assyria and Babylonia," *Orientalia* 49 (1980), 180.

The Chronicle of Early Kings narrates events from the reign of Sargon of Akkad (2334-2279 BCE) to the reign of Agum III (1450 BCE). Grayson states that source material for this chronicle was provided by omens and Weidner Chronicle, and the use of the latter is evident in the scribes' depiction of Sargon and Shulgi.[40] At first, Sargon enjoys military success and is a prosperous king (*ABC* 20 A 2-17), but his cultic negligence initiates Marduk's divine wrath.

> He dug up the dirt of the pit of Babylon and made a counterpart next to Agade. Because of the wrong he had done the great lord Marduk became angry and wiped out his people by famine. They (his subjects) rebelled against him from east to west and he (Marduk) afflicted [him] with insomnia. (*ABC* 20 A 18-23; cf. *ABC* 19:50-52)

As is the case in Chronicles, a king's behaviour and decisions affect an entire nation, as the people get wiped out by famine because of Sargon's impious deeds. Shulgi, like Sargon, commits cultic abominations against Marduk: "Shulgi, son of Ur-Nammu, provided abundant food for Eridu, which is on the seashore. But he had criminal tendencies and took away the property of Esagil and Babylon as booty. Bel caused… to consume his body… killed him" (*ABC* 20 A 28-30; cf. *ABC* 19:63-64). However, it is important to mention that in regards to the Chronicle of Early Kings, the king, god, and temple narrative pattern is limited to the reigns of Sargon and Shulgi.

> The fact that two of the kings, Sargon and Shulgi, are condemned for having desecrated Babylon is no indication of the writer's purpose. None of the other kings mentioned are said to have done good or bad things to Babylon. Besides, the passages in which these kings are condemned are copied from the Weidner Chronicle, a document which regularly condemns kings who did not treat Babylon with respect.[41]

Like Shulgi's punishment in the Chronicle of Early Kings, Tukulti-Ninurta is punished for mistreating Babylon, Esagil, and Marduk in Chronicle P.

---

[40] Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 45, 48; *idem*, "Assyria and Babylonia," 180-81.

[41] Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 48.

> … Tukult]i-Ninurta (i) returned to Babylon and brought […] … […] near. He destroyed the wall of Babylon (and) [pu]t the Babylonians to the sword. He took out the property of Esagil and Babylon amid the booty He removed the great lord Marduk [from] his [dais] and sent (him) to Assyria. He put his governors in Karduniash. For seven years Tukulti-Ninurta (I) controlled Karduniash. After the Akkadian officers of Karduniash rebelled and put Adad-shuma-usur on his father's throne, Ashur-nasir-apli, son of Tukulti-Ninurta (I)-who had carried out criminal designs on Babylon-and the officers of Assyria rebelled against him (Tukulti-Ninurta I), removed him [from] his throne, shut him up in Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta in a room and killed him. (*ABC* 22 iv 3-11)

Tukulti-Ninurta's episode is comparable to Ahaz in Chronicles (2 Chron. 28:21), since both kings commit sacrilege by stealing from a divine sovereign's temple and subsequently are punished. However, Tukulti-Ninurta, an Assyrian king, robs a foreign temple, Esagil in Babylon, whereas Ahaz, a Judahite king, robs his own temple, the temple of YHWH in Jerusalem. Additionally, unlike Tukulti-Ninurta, Ahaz is not killed for his act of impiety. This being said, the different punishments for Tukulti-Ninurta and Ahaz possibly may be attributed to core facts; that is, Ashur-nasir-apli's murder of Tukulti-Ninurta may be a core fact, which was then associated with the latter's crimes against Babylon. Importantly, the reader is reminded before Tukulti-Ninurta's death that he "…had carried out criminal designs on Babylon," acts which explained and justified his demise.

It is worth noting that temple robbery is also punished in Greek historiography. For instance, in Herodotus' *Histories*, the Persians are associated with desecration and (attempted) robbery of Greek temples (6.19; 6.96; 8.33; 8.53; 8.109; 8.129; 8.35-39; 9.65), for which they are recipients of divine retribution. In this regard, Persian robbery of Greek temples more resembles Tukulti-Ninurta's robbery of Esagil in that these are instances in which a foreigner force robs sacred space(s) that are central to the narrative.

Similarly, in Xenophon's *Hellenica*, in instances in which a temple is robbed (7.1.46; 7.3.8; 7.4.33; 7.4.34), or there is intent to rob a temple, as in the case of Jason of Pherae (6.4.30), punishment soon follows.[42] In the cases of Jason of Pherae intending to steal sacred treasures at Delphi and of the Arcadian Confederacy (7.4.33-34) stealing the sacred treasures from Olympia, an outside force/outside forces commit an act of sacrilege against a temple, acts which correspond to those of Tukulti-Ninurta or the Persians. However, Euphron of Sicyon steals sacred treasures from Sicyon, his home city, in order to hire mercenaries to maintain his position as a tyrant,[43] an impious act which corresponds to that of Ahaz, who of course robs his own temple in order to pay Tilgath-pilneser[44] of Assyria for military assistance.

B. ADAD-SHUMAR-USUR EPIC AND NABOPOLASSAR EPIC. Babylonian historical epics, like the Akkadian historical epics explained in Chapter 1, are poetic narratives concerned with the acts of kings (i.e., emplotted external referents presented in the structure of an epic). The Adad-shumar-usur Epic and the Nabopolassar Epic are examples of this genre. These texts may be evidence of a sub-genre of historical discourse in Mesopotamia. The poetic narrative structure of an epic is what separates these historical discourses from those discussed above (i.e., narrative–style chronicles). Babylonian historical epics present a *topos* in which "… the supremacy of Marduk prevails over the gods and the ill fate that befalls a Babylonian king who neglects or ignores his deity's cult."[45] Because of "formal similarity", Grayson suggests that the collection of texts published in his book possibly belongs to one series.[46]

---

[42] Frances Skoczylas Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious in Xenophon's *Hellenica*," *Harvard Theological Review* 91.3 (1998), 267-69.

[43] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 267-68.

[44] This is the way in which Chronicles consistently refers to the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pileser III (see 1 Chr 5:6, 26; 2 Chr 28:20).

Although the text is broken badly and laconic, the Adad-shumar-usur Epic's fragmentary remains still illustrate the important relationship between the success of a king and his piety toward Marduk and his cult. The Adad-shumar-usur Epic narrates a successful rebellion against Adad-shumar-usur because he neglects Marduk and Babylon. After the rebellion, the penitent king, Adad-shumar-usur, confesses his impiety to Marduk, performs pious deeds, and restores Esagil.[47] In column ii, which is very laconic, it is suggested that although the rebellion was successful, the king is spared because he repents for his wrongdoing; once he is spared, the king requests and is granted to make amends to Marduk.[48]

> 'Do not fear, O king, our lords the nobles of Babylon you [...] To Bel, lord of l[ords], you may pray that you alone he might bring [you in...]'... hand [he] entered Esagil, he headed to[ward...] [... ...] he kisses, the doors of the shrine [...] [...] his [...] to Bel go [his] prayer[s(...)] [... ...] Bel, god of the lands, *saw* ... [...] [... ...] his misdeeds (and) his crimes, he praises [...] [... ...] his ... was *moaning*, the people under divine protect[ion...] [... ... Esa]gil he praises [...] [...] to Marduk he made sacrifices [...] [*to the gods* ...] ... *and* Ea they are pleasing [...] [... ...] ... ... [...]. (ii 19-31)[49]

---

[45] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 43.

[46] Grayson includes the Historical Epic Fragment about the Kassite Period, Adad-shumar-usur Epic, Nabopolassar Epic, Historical Fragment regarding Evil-Merodach, and A Babylonian Historical Epic Fragment in his section on Babylonian Historical Epics. I have chosen to include the Adad-shumar-usur Epic and the Nabopolassar Epic because these discourses are relatively complete (i.e., well preserved) and illustrate the important relationship between the success of a king and his piety toward Marduk, Babylon, and Esagil. The Historical Epic Fragment about the Kassite Period, Historical Fragment regarding Evil-Merodach, and A Babylonian Historical Epic Fragment are very fragmentary and incomplete, and I have decided to exclude them from the discussion because of their laconic state. A discussion on two epics that contain the "king, Marduk, Babylon, and Esagil" narrative pattern seems sufficient. See Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 41-97.

[47] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 56; idem, "Assyria and Babylonia," 186-87.

[48] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 57-58.

[49] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 69-70.

After his repentance to Marduk, Adad-shumar-usur restores Esagil (iii 8-23).[50] Manasseh's repentance (2 Chron. 33:12-13) is, of course, reminiscent of the narrative pattern in the Adad-shumar-usur Epic as exemplified by the Judean monarch being captured and taken back to Babylon (33:10-11) as punishment for his impiety (i.e., not seeking YHWH), and then humbling himself before YHWH, repenting, and seeking YHWH (33:12-13). Manasseh is rewarded for his repentance, and similar to Adad-shumar-usur, he is given rest from his opponents, performs pious deeds, builds, and restores cult and temple (33:14-16).

Only a fragment of the Nabopolassar Epic has been preserved. However, what does exist is invaluable as it provides an account of the Chaldean dynasty; the defeat of the Assyrians (column ii) and the coronation and early years of Nabopolassar (column iii) are the events narrated.[51] Grayson expounds that it is reasonable to assume that the entire epic was about Nabopolassar and the foundation of the Chaldean dynasty.[52] Marduk is recognized as the driving force behind the events which lead up to the foundation of the Chaldean dynasty as Marduk elects Nabopolassar to be king and defeats the king's enemies.[53]

> The princes of the land being assembled, Nab[opolassar *they bless*], Opening their fists [they...] the sovereignty. Bel, in the assembly of the gods, [gave] the ruling-power to [*Nabopolassar*]. The king, the reliable command [...] "With the standard I shall constantly conquer [*your*] enemies, I shall place [your] throne in Babylon." (iii 3-8)[54]

---

[50] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 58.

[51] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 78; idem, "Assyria and Babylonia," 187.

[52] Grayson, "Assyria and Babylonia," 187.

[53] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 79; idem, "Assyria and Babylonia," 187.

[54] Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, 85.

The divine election of a king is well known from Mesopotamian law codes. For instance, like Nabopolassar in the Nabopolassar Epic, Hammurabi is reputed as divinely elected to sit on the throne of Babylon in the Laws of Hammurabi.

> [A]t that time, the gods Anu and Enlil, for the enhancement of the well-being of the people, named me by name: Hammurabi, the pious prince, who venerates the gods, to make justice prevail in the land, to abolish the wicked and the evil, to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak.... I am Hammurabi, the shepherd, selected by the god Enlil, he who heaps high abundance and plenty. (I 27-49, 50-62)[55]

Similar to Marduk's election of Nabopolassar, YHWH elects David as the first king and founder of a dynasty in Chronicles. Additionally, YHWH defeats David's enemies and brings peace to the land for the reign of Solomon, just as Marduk defeats Nabopolassar's enemies.

2.2.2 SUMMARY: Babylonian historical discourses, both narrative–style chronicles and historical epics, probably were used to instruct kings, the elite, and the general public how to behave piously, including proper behaviour toward Marduk, Babylon, and Esagil, of which the social centre in Babylonian historical discourses is comprised. According to these texts, pious behaviour and proper cultic observance contributed to a long and prosperous reign. In these historical discourses, Marduk rewarded pious kings and punished impious kings. Perhaps most importantly, Babylonian historical discourses followed the "single monarch pattern" that previously was established in the Sumerian King List; however, the significant difference is that while dynasties and kingships were passed from city to city in the Sumerian King List, the single monarchy always remained in Babylon in the Babylonian historical narratives.

---

[55] Martha T. Roth, *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (Ed. P. Michalowski; Writings from the Ancient World 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2nd edn, 1997), 76-77.

2.3 The Histories

2.3.1 NARRATIVE AND DIDACTICISM. The value of moderation appears to be a social centre in the *Histories*. According to Immerwahr, Herodotus' history "... teaches the value of moderation."[56] Hall calls this social centre "... the fundamental Greek law of human existence, which prescribed that excessive prosperity and satiety lead first to hubris and then to destruction."[57] Herodotus used his *Histories* to warn his fifth century BCE Athens audience about the dangers of imperialism and disregard for other people's *nomos* and sovereignty.[58] Herodotus employed Croesus and Xerxes (and the Persians collectively) as paradigms to teach his intended audience, as well as future generations, about changing human fortune (1.5), *hybris*, and imperialism. Herodotus feared that his fifth century BCE Athenian contemporaries were becoming the most recent incarnation of the Persians, a group of people who once were hard and poor, and whose rise to power results in *hybris* and imperialistic intentions. In fact, Flowers and Marincola note that the Athenians begin to take on Persian-like qualities towards the end of the *Histories*.

> In their incipient imperialism and their 'barbarian' retribution, the Athenians at the end seem to be beginning a new cycle of history, one that will see Athens within the next decades assume hegemony (often ruthlessly maintained) over other Greek states, some of whom had been liberated by her from Persian suzerainty. The closure of the work, therefore, operates on two levels, ending one story while taking heed of a new one that is beginning, and one that will in significant ways resemble the story just told.[59]

---

[56] Immerwahr, *Form and Thought*, 308-9.

[57] Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian*, 70.

[58] See Charles W. Fornara, *Herodotus: An Interpretive Essay* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 90-91; John Moles, "Herodotus and Athens," in E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 33-52.

[59] Michael A. Flower and John Marincola (eds.), *Herodotus Histories: Book IX* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 39. Flower and Marincola cite the example of the attack on the Chersonese as a specific example of the Athenian tyranny that manifests toward the end of the *Histories*. "The Persian/Greek dichotomy may also be breaking

In Herodotus' view, the once freedom-loving, just, and hard Athens had become autocratic, corrupt, and soft (i.e., a slave to luxury and wealth), and eventually would fall, like Croesus or the Persian empire.[60]

The heroes of the Persian Wars became the tyrants of the Greek world within a generation. Herodotus, a contemporary of the Peloponnesian War, also instructed his intended audience about the benefits of a unified Greece which together overcame the odds with the help of the gods to defeat a great world empire, the Persians. Raaflaub summarizes well the didactic elements of the *Histories* and its message to its intended audience:

> In fact, the historian seems to have structured his work consciously so as to keep his audience constantly aware of their present, troubled as it was by disunity and constant warfare among Hellenes, imperialism, tyrannical oppression, and enslavement of cities. As seems natural for a contemporary of the Athenian empire and the Peloponnesian War, such topicality focuses heavily, though far from exclusively, on the political and historical role of Athens. Skillful foreshadowing on a large and small scale, the specific repetition of a set of specific motifs, and the use of highly charged terms or arguments familiar to Herodotus' contemporaries draw attention to themes the historian considers crucial and elicit associations with the continuing importance of these same themes far beyond the chronological limits of the *Histories*.[61]

Moles has suggested that the Athenian empire turned Herodotus to history writing and that Solon's warning to Croesus, Amasis' to Polycrates, Artabanus' to Xerxes, and Cyrus' to the Persians are actually Herodotus' warnings to the Athenian empire.[62] Interestingly, Herodotus addresses the Athenian empire at the beginning of his narrative (1.5) and at the very end of his narrative with Cyrus'

---

down at the end of the *Histories* in the Athenian attack on the Chersonese (114-20). When the Athenians are at last successful, they capture the Persian governor Artaÿctes and his son; the son is then stoned to death before his father's eyes, and Artaÿctes himself is crucified, a punishment that, as far as the *Histories* is concerned, is one characteristic of the barbarians (*Herodotus Histories: Book IX*, 39).

[60] See James Redfield, "Herodotus the Tourist," *Classical Philology* 80 (1985), 97-118.

[61] Kurt A. Raaflaub, "Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of His Time," *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 166.

[62] John Moles, "Herodotus and Athens," 49, 52.

warning (9.122). To Herodotus, if the Athenians did not heed his warnings, they too would meet their ultimate demise, like the other imperialists who are warned throughout the *Histories*.

Herodotus' ideal seems to encompass a world of moderation in which there is no war and imperialism, where people leave each other to their own devices and are free to practice their own *nomos*. In the *Histories*, Persian imperialism begins to create a dystopian world where balance and natural order are upset. Persian *hybris* challenges the realm of the gods in several instances: Xerxes wants his empire to end at the domain of Zeus and the heavens (i.e., he wants to rule the entire earth); the Persians disrespect the Greek god and their temples. This, of course, upsets the balance between the gods and the human realm. Furthermore, Persian imperialism and *hybris* afflict the natural world and its equilibrium: Xerxes wants to rule both Asia and Europe, thus upsetting the equilibrium of the two continents; Xerxes punishes the Hellespont (7.35); Xerxes wants to divert a river (7.128); and the Persian army drinks a Thessalian river dry (7.196). All of these acts suggest that Persian imperialism goes contrary to the natural order of the world and universe and therefore creates a dystopian environment. It is the responsibility of the gods to punish the Persians in order to restore order and balance to the world. Immerwahr states that "[t]he main concern of the divine is maintenance of balance."[63] This appears to be the reason why the gods do not allow human fortune to stay in the same place for too long—they have to maintain order.

---

[63] Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, 312.

2.3.2 DIVINE PROVIDENCE. Lateiner does not consider divine providence to be an integral part of Herodotus' historical causation, as he suggests that the divine rarely intervenes in human affairs in the *Histories*. According to Lateiner, although Herodotus may have detected divine patterns, textual evidence from the *Histories* suggests that these are distinct from historical causation.[64] This is not to suggest that Lateiner does not acknowledge divine activity within the *Histories*,[65] but relative to some scholars (as will be evident below), he seems to downplay its significance. In Lateiner's view, "Herodotean *tisis* does not require gods;" that is, although Herodotus offers the reader tales of the supernatural, "... very few are recognized as due to divine causation."[66] Finally, Lateiner's interpretation of the text places human agency and human actions in a centripetal position; divine and supernatural activities, on the other hand, sit on the periphery, as they are "... more often explained, doubted, or denied than admitted."[67] Thus, regarding historical causation and divine providence in the *Histories*, Laitener suggests that human agency/free will and moral choices play a much more significant role than the function attributed to divine providence and fate.

For some scholars, however, divine providence is self-evident in the *Histories*. For instance, Desmond states, "[t]he *Histories* are pervaded by a conviction in divine intervention."[68] Harrison contends that divine action is evident throughout the text, as Herodotus' religious beliefs do indeed affect his historiography.[69] Furthermore, Herodotus' divine intervention often comes in the form of divine providence. In fact, Harrison believes that Herodotus' belief in the possibility of divine providence is irrefutable, and as such, certain impious actions inevitably were subject to retribution from the gods. In other words, if some misfortune occurred, it must be retribution for an earlier action.[70] It is apparent throughout the *Histories* that Herodotus' belief in divine providence constitutes a complete moral system: unjust acts meet with a just, proportional response; "great injustices receive great vengeances".[71]

---

[64] Donald Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 65, 198-200.

[65] In his discussion on 'Moral Principles in History', Lateiner acknowledges a divine role in *tisis*, or retribution. For instance, in maintaining world balance (i.e., cosmic order), *tisis* may have a divine origin (cosmic restoration). *Tisis* operates in nature, among humans, and on a cosmic level to maintain balance. Furthermore, Lateiner admits that Herdotus did not "... finally solve the historical problem of free-will and the role of non-human powers in human events." (Lateiner, *Historical Method*, 140-44, 194).

[66] Lateiner, *Historical Method*, 198.

[67] Lateiner, *Historical Method*, 199.

In the *Histories*, possible reasons for divine retribution being inflicted upon the impious include both crimes against humanity and crimes against the divine. Examples of the former include Pheretime (4.205) and Panionius (8.105-106); the latter, retribution for crimes against the divine, may involve religious crimes and/or sacrilege, which includes punishment for ravaging or burning of temples (8.129; 8.135-8.139; 9.65). This being said, the most common acts that provoke divine action are acts of *hybris*. It is in this manner that Herodotus' divine maintains order and balance by preserving the boundaries between humans and the divine. According to Immerwahr, "[a]nother function of the divine is the function of separation, without which equalization cannot exist."[72] Throughout the *Histories*, humans who are guilty of *hybris* (i.e., those who challenge the gods by trying to exceed human limitations) eventually are humbled by divine retribution. It is interesting to note that in ancient Near Eastern literature it is also the job of the divine to punish *hybris* and maintain separation between humans and the divine. For instance, oracles in biblical prophetic literature against *hybristic* parties are quite common (Isa. 10:12; 13:11; 16:6-7; Jer. 49: 4-5, 16; Hos. 7:10-12; Amos 6:8-14; 8:7-10; Obad. 1:3, *NASB*). The Babylonian Prayer to Marduk also emphasizes human limits and the consequential divine retribution for transgressing them: "Divine affliction is for mankind to bear. I am surely responsible for some neglect of you, I have surely trespassed the limits set by the gods" (15-7).[73]

---

[68] William Desmond, "Punishments and the Conclusion of Herodotus' *Histories*," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 44.1 (2004), 29.

[69] Thomas Harrison, *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 13. For Laitener's response to *Divinity and History*, see Donald Lateiner, "Review Article: Assessing the Nature of Herodotus' Mind and Text," *Classical Philology* 97.4 (2002), 371-82.

[70] Harrison, *Divinity and History*, 102-3.

[71] Harrison, *Divinity and History*, 110.

Dewald understands Herodotus' historical causation as a combination of human agency and fate, or divine providence.

> Herodotus uses a fairly conventional fifth century set of religious beliefs. He himself etymologizes the word 'gods' (*theoi* in Greek) as the 'powers that set the world in order'... The gods and fate represent for Herodotus a second and superpersonal strand of causation that occasionally impinges on the interplay of ordinary human choice and the various kinds of secular causation unrolling at the same time in the narrative.[74]

Similarly, both Gould and Mikalson perceive more than one cause at work behind Herodotus' *Histories*, with divine providence playing a significant role. It is evident to Gould that Herodotus took the possibility of divine causation as seriously as he took human causation; thus, both types of causation are centripetal in Gould's view.[75] Mikalson sees a plethora of religious/divine explanations and causes, both explicit and implicit, in Herodotus' account of the Persian wars. Although Mikalson interprets divine retribution to be an important historical cause for Herodotus, he claims that it is neither the sole nor the most important explanation. To Mikalson, the interpretation of the *Histories* is not a "zero-sum game" in which certain explanations diminish the significance of other explanations.[76] In other words, the perspectives of Lateiner and Harrison do not have to be mutually exclusive.

---

[72] Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, 313.
[73] Translation from Benjamin R. Foster, "Prayer to Marduk (1.14)," in W.W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Inscriptions from the Biblical World* (3 vols; Leiden: Brill, 2003), I, 416.
[74] Carolyn Dewald, "Introduction," *The Histories* (Trans. Robin Waterfield; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), xxxvi.

Mikalson's conclusion about the *Histories* not being a zero-sum game is not surprising, since it is not uncommon to find both divine providence and human agency simultaneously at work in ancient historical discourses.[77] For instance, in both Chronicles and Babylonian historical writings, humans make their own moral choices, for which they are either rewarded or punished by YHWH or Marduk. Even in instances in which fate has a role in an act of divine retribution, including Huldah's prophecy and the destruction of Jerusalem in Chronicles or Croesus' or Xerxes' demise in the *Histories*, all of which will be discussed in further detail below, human agency and moral choices are also factors. Thus, although divine forces may guide humans in some cases, for the most part, humans are responsible for their own actions and the consequences for those actions.

---

[75] John Gould, "Herodotus and Religion," in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 93.

[76] Jon D. Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 7-8.

[77] Double determination is also common in Greek tragedy and epic.

In my view, when considering divine providence, Mikalson's inclusive statement about Herodotus' work holds well; that is, the text is ambiguous, diverse, and multi-layered, and therefore, may provide several possible explanations. In other words, like Mikalson, I consider divine providence to be an important component of Herodotus' apparatus of historical causation, but this does not necessarily mean that it is the most important explanation for all instances in which it is mentioned nor does it exclude the other possible explanations. Rather, divine providence may co-exist with non-divine explanations and causes. I suppose that this is somewhat of a default position given how people account for their experiences in our culture. When people explain events in their lives, in addition to accounting for their own actions, they often attribute an element of fate to their own experiences. For instance, when lovers tell other how and when they met, fate often is given credit for placing them in the right place at the right time.

The ambiguities within the text may lead to myriad explanations. The ambiguity in 7.152 is evident. Herodotus states, "I am obliged to record things that I am told, *but I am certainly not required to believe them*—this remark may be taken to *the whole of my account*."[78] By applying this statement to the "whole of the account," it is difficult to privilege certain explanations over others. For instance, Lateiner suggests that in 7.129, 7.189, and 7.192, Herodotus doubts divine intervention, but I interpret these instances to be cases in which Herodotus leaves the interpretation open to the reader; that is, Herodotus does not trivialize or discount the divine explanations; rather he provides more than one possible interpretation for these accounts. In other words, in all three instances, Herodotus' explanations, divine or natural, are *not* mutually exclusive.

---

[78] My emphasis. Throughout this paper, all quotes from Herodotus are from *The Histories* (Trans. Robin Waterfield. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

First, in 7.129, regarding the Poseidon-made ravine through which the Peneius flows, Herodotus does not exclude, or even doubt, the possible divine explanation, as he states: "This is not implausible [this is reasonable], because the sight of the ravine would make anyone who thinks that Poseidon is responsible for earthquakes, and therefore that rifts formed by earthquakes are caused by him, say that it was the work of Poseidon." Dewald points out that Herodotus does not disbelieve in Poseidon but points out that a person who takes the epithet "Earth Shaker" seriously will think that Poseidon is responsible for earthquakes.[79] Mikalson suggests that Herodotus accepts the common association of Poseidon with earthquakes.[80] Thus, Herodotus himself believes that an earthquake, which is reasonable to associate with Poseidon, caused the rift, and therefore, he offers the reader both a divine and a 'rationalized' explanation. In this context, the two explanations are complementary, and not mutually exclusive.

Second, in 7.189, when weighing the probability of the Athenians bringing Boreas, the north wind, against the Persians in order to destroy the Persian fleet, Herodotus simply states, "I cannot say." This account, like the one above, is ambiguous and Herodotus leaves it open for interpretation.

Third, in 7.191, in considering why a fierce storm subsided, Herodotus offers the following explanation: "… the Magi performed sacrifices and set about soothing the wind with spells, and also sacrificed to Thetis and the Nereids, until the storm died down on the fourth day—or *maybe* it did so on its own accord."[81] Although Herodotus appears to be reluctant to concede that the Magi means were successful, nevertheless, this account, like the two above, appears to be an instance in which two possible explanations, divine and natural, are provided. The two possible explanations are not mutually exclusive, nor does Herodotus suggest that one is more likely or more valid than the other. In sum, interpretations of these three accounts are contingent upon the reader's worldview. [82]

---

[79] Also, see Dewald, "Explanatory Notes," *The Histories*, 701.

[80] Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion*, 137.

Finally, Gould makes an important point regarding Herodotus' reluctance to make explicit associations between divine providence and historical events. Gould argues that such caution and uncertainty towards divine providence as an explanation for historical causation should be attributed to neither scepticism nor religious disbelief. Furthermore, he contends that there is an "uncertainty principle", a necessary component of any phenomenological religious system in which divine acts are not revealed explicitly, but rather are inferred from ambiguous "outward signs".[83] In Gould's words:

> Thus I would argue that Herodotus' expressions of hesitations and uncertainty in questions of divine action in human experience are no more than an expression of a universal (and among ancient Greeks universally accepted) implicit acknowledgement of the limitations of human knowledge in such matters.[84]

Gould asserts that in regard to implied divine retribution, Lateiner greatly over-simplifies "… this aspect of Herodotus' dealings with religion."[85]

---

[81] My emphasis.

[82] Herodotus' statement in 2.123 seems to support such an interpretation: "Anyone who finds such things credible can make of these stories what he wishes. My job, throughout this account is simply to record whatever I am told by each of my sources."

[83] Gould, "Herodotus and Religion," 94.

[84] Gould, "Herodotus and Religion," 94.

[85] Gould, "Herodotus and Religion," 98.

2.3.3 SUMMARY: Since there are accounts in which Herodotus offers an exclusively divine explanation/an explicit case of divine providence,[86] and therefore, has no problem with such explanations, it makes little sense to conclude that he dismisses the possibility of divine providence when it is mentioned in conjunction with a human or natural cause (privileging a non-divine explanation over and above a divine explanation). In other words, implied divine providence does not equate a dismissal of divine providence. Perhaps such interpretations may be result of a modern audience imposing its constructions of history/historical methods on an ancient text.

Divine providence has an important function of maintaining Herodotus' moral system; that is, those who act excessively and are guilty of *hybris* usually meet with divine retribution. Therefore, divine providence was central to Herodotus' message to his late fifth century BCE Athenian audience. In other words, Herodotus was telling his intended audience that their *hybristic* actions would not go unpunished, and therefore, they must change their conduct. If the gods maintain balance, once any human exceeds the divinely determined boundaries, retribution strikes the guilty party, regardless of ethnicity—Persian or Athenian. If the late fifth century BCE Athenians' *hybris* continued to grow, they would meet an end similar to the Persians.

---

[86] See, for instance, 2.120: "In my opinion, this was because the gods were arranging things so that in their annihilation of the Trojans might make it completely clear to others that the severity of a crime is matched by the severity of the ensuing punishment at the gods' hands. That is my view, at any rate." In 7.137: "What happened does seem to me to be a particularly clear case of divinity at work… but what makes me certain that it was the work of the gods is that fell on the children of the men sent to the Persian king to appease this [divine] anger in the first place…." In 8.77: "I cannot argue against the truth of oracles, because when they speak clearly I do not want to discredit them… I hesitate to challenge the validity of oracles myself, and I do not accept such challenges from others either."

2.4 The Hellenica

2.4.1 NARRATIVE AND DIDACTICISM. The advent of the fourth century BCE coincided with changes to many aspects of the Hellenic world; that is, the end of the Peloponnesian War resulted in the fall of Athens, and led to great change, both politically and intellectually. By the end of the fifth century BCE, sophism and the development of professional rhetoric emerged, an emergence which had a profound effect on prose composition and led to various responses from Athenian intelligentsia, two of whom were Socrates and Isocrates. Albeit in different ways, Socrates and Isocrates developed and propagated systems of moral virtues. Pownall contends that their influence "… contributed to the use of the past to illustrate moral exempla in certain fourth-century prose works."[87] For instance, the moral teachings of Socrates particularly influenced a group of (mainly) young Athenian aristocrats, which included both Plato and Xenophon. Thus, it is of little surprise that the works of both Xenophon and Plato centre on moral and ethical matters. As a result of a Socratic moral influence, both Xenophon and Plato were impelled to use the past as a means of moral instruction of the elite.[88]

Xenophon's presentation of moral exempla is explicit and the primary focus of his historical narratives.[89] In fact, Pownall suggests that the moral and didactic elements are the primary focus of Xenophon's historical works.[90] As a result, "… he sometimes gives full treatment to matters that he believes to be of greater moral significance, while passing over or treating less fully other subjects to subordinate them to a moral point."[91] Xenophon was most concerned with instructing the fourth century BCE educated elite about moral virtues such as courage, self-control, and piety.[92] Thus, the attributes of courage, self-control, and piety form a social centre in Xenophon's historiography. For Xenophon, "[g]ood moral leaders are pious, just, and self-controlled."[93] In the *Hellenica*, "[a] good (that is, moral as well as competent leader) commander will meet with success in the field, and conversely, a bad (immoral as well as incompetent) leader will meet with a reverse, or worse."[94]

---

[87] Frances Pownall, *Lessons From the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose* (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2004), 5.
[88] Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 21.
[89] Pownall, *Lessons From the Past*, 1.
[90] Pownall, *Lessons From the Past*, 29.

The ideals that Xenophon presented in the *Hellenica* to teach moral virtues to his intended audience are evident in the *Anabasis* and the *Cyropaedia.* According to Dillery, the model for Xenophon's ideal community is revealed in the *Anabasis*. To Xenophon, the Ten Thousand was a mobile *polis* and an ideal community; they had a strong military *ethos*, strong leadership, obedient community members, cohesiveness, and discipline.[95] Xenophon's representation of the ideal ruler, Cyrus the Great, in the *Cyropaedia* embodies many ideals used in the *Hellenica*: Cyrus is pious (toward the gods), wise, self-controlled, humane, and courageous.[96]

Xenophon provided moral lessons to his intended audience via speeches and paradigms.[97] Dillery states that: "Presentation of paradigms, both good and bad, of both communities and individuals, permits Xenophon not only to provide moral lessons but also to construct historical explanations, as those places and persons are made to represent larger truths about the past."[98] For instance, Xenophon used the Phlisians (7.2.1-23) as a paradigm for an ideal and moral community in the *Hellenica*; the Phlisians are a unified, obedient, loyal, pious, self-controlled, and courageous community.[99] The Thirty Tyrants of Athens (2.3.11-2.4.43) prove to be the opposite of Phlisians—they are greedy, impious (toward the gods), lawless, and lack self-control and self-knowledge.[100] In the *Hellenica*, it is necessary to behave properly toward both the gods and humanity in order to achieve political and military success.[101]

---

[91] Pownall, *Lessons From the Past*, 82.
[92] Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 178.
[93] Pownall, *Lessons From the Past*, 80.
[94] Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 80.
[95] John Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of His Times* (London/New York: Routledge, 1995), 59-98.
[96] Deborah Levine Gera, *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique* (Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 280-85.
[97] Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 110.

2.4.2 DIVINE PROVIDENCE. According to Dillery, Xenophon's construction of the divine may be best characterized as "the motor of history".[102] Although Xenophon may not refer to "the divine" often, the *Hellenica* is laden with instances of divine causality, divine retribution, and condemnation of impious acts, as a religious belief system underlines his historiography. Dillery believes that Xenophon's reliance on divine providence as an explanation for historical causation is indisputable.[103] Moreover, to Xenophon, the divine is omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent, and therefore, humans may be punished for impious intentions (eg. Jason of Pherae in 6.4.30).[104]

> Xenophon believed the gods supervised the actions of mortals and rewarded those who remained pious; in a sense, then, the continued success of a

---

[98] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 130.
[99] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 130.
[100] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 146-63.
[101] Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 84.
[102] John Dillery, *History of His Times*, 237.
[103] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 180.
[104] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 184-85.

> community was a mark of its piety, and presumably if it met with set back one could assume that it had lost the favour of the gods through impiety. This assumption is not hard to make if we remember that the gods in Xenophon's thinking scrutinize not only the actions and words of human beings but also their motivations, and therefore it is easy to imagine them punishing immoral behaviour in such a way as to affect the course of history.[105]

For Xenophon, the divine is an awesome and invisible force which pervades the universe and works for good throughout the universe by ordering everything at all times.[106] Further, Dillery states that because of Xenophon's model of the divine, all history has a point; that is, "… nothing happens without in some way being connected to the workings of this providential force."[107] Xenophon's model of the divine and its relationship to history is similar to those found in Chronicles and Babylonian historical narratives. As was discussed above, YHWH and Marduk are also intimately connected to all activity in Chronicles and Babylonian historical narrative respectively.

In the *Hellenica*, breaking an oath (3.4.6, 11; 5.4.1; 5.4.11-12; 6.4.2-3; 6.5.10; 7.4.36), violating sanctuary (2.3.53, 55; 4.4.3; 4.5.6; 6.5.9; 7.2.6), a cult or a festival (1.4.12, 14; 1.7.8; 4.4.2; 5.2.29), neglecting or manipulating religious ritual (3.1.18; 3.2.22; 3.4.4; 3.5.5; 7.1.27), and damaging or robbing a temple (4.5.4; 6.4.30; 6.5.9; 7.4.31-327.1.46; 7.3.8; 7.4.33; 7.4.34) all constitute acts that may be punished by divine retribution.[108] Yet despite Xenophon's belief in divine retribution, it is not common for him to comment explicitly upon either divine providence (or the divine in general) or specific acts of impiety.[109] Dillery suggests that Xenophon uses divine providence to explain "incomprehensible" events, or those which defy human explanation. Pownall, however, considers Dillery's explanation to be insufficient, because such explanations tend to minimize the role of the divine, which appears to be "incongruent" with Xenophon's reputation for religiosity. Pownall questions why a moral historian, such as Xenophon, infrequently mentions divine providence and refrains from explicit condemnation of the impious.[110]

---

[105] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 188-89.

[106] In *Memorabilia*, the transcendent god is the cause of all existence: "'… and especially he who co-ordinates and holds together the universe, wherein all things are fair and good, and presents them ever unimpaired and sound and ageless for our use, and quicker than thought to serve us unerringly, is manifest in his supreme works, and yet is unseen by us in the ordering of them'" (4.3.13).

[107] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 187-88.

[108] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 276-77.

Pownall's explanation is similar to that of Gould's mentioned above: "Finally, as John Gould has recently argued for Herodotus, Xenophon's reluctance to voice condemnation of impiety directly and to bring the gods more explicitly into his narrative is probably due to hesitation to express certainty about matters that are fundamentally unknowable."[111] Thus, claims of certitude regarding divine providence and retribution in the *Hellenica* are not possible, for only inferences may be made; like Herodotus, Xenophon "remains within confines imposed" by ancient Greek religion. In sum, within the scope of religious thought, Xenophon seems to model himself on Herodotus, "… not only in his reluctance to attribute the fates of evildoers to the gods directly, but also in his use of the 'divine' as an abstract force."[112]

2.4.3 SUMMARY: Xenophon tried to teach his fourth century BCE intended audience ideal moral values. The *Hellenica* provided the intended audience with a plethora of examples of how political successes were the direct result of proper moral conduct while political failures were the consequence of impious behaviour. Xenophon's divine, an awesome and invisible force pervading the universe and working for good throughout the universe by ordering all existence, enforced his moral ideals. The intended audience was taught that people are unable to escape the divine force which punished those who violated Xenophon's fourth century BCE ideals.

---

[109] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 251.
[110] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 251-52.
[111] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 273.
[112] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 273.

2.5 Analysis

It is evident that Chronicles, Babylonian historical narratives, the *Histories,* and the *Hellenica* taught their unique intended audiences different lessons about different core values. In other words, although these texts moralized by teaching contemporary intended audiences about the present through historical discourse, each text was formed in a unique socio-historical milieu and taught values relevant to that unique setting. Although the divine enforces the observance of the social centre in these texts, moral lessons from each text make most sense in its own respective milieu.

This being said, Chronicles and Babylonian historical narratives used the king, divine sovereign, central city, and central cult Near Eastern narrative pattern, so these discourses obviously have more in common with each other than they do with Greek historiography. It is well known that Babylonian literature had a profound influence on that of ancient Israel, so this comes as little surprise. In fact, a king's pious or impious behaviour, which is determined by proper cultic observance, determines the unfolding of history and the actions of YHWH in

Chronicles and Marduk in Babylonian historical discourses. Furthermore, the fate of the nation is contingent upon the good or bad actions of the king in both Chronicles and Babylonian historical narratives. A major distinguishing feature however is that Chronicles used this narrative pattern to teach a kingless community whereas Babylonian historical narratives instructed future kings.

Similarly, the *Histories* and the *Hellenica* share a common fifth to fourth century BCE Greek milieu, which obviously explains why these two discourses have more in common with each other than they do with Chronicles or Babylonian historical narratives; however, as pointed out by Pownall, political and intellectual change had occurred in the Hellenic world between the composition of the two texts, change which greatly contributed to the uniqueness of the discourse and its moral message. Despite the uniqueness of the discourses, Herodotus would have had a profound effect on Xenophon's work, since Xenophon would have been following genre rules established by Herodotus. For instance, Herodotus' perception of the divine as a source of historical causation carried through to the works of Xenophon and to a majority of later historians,[113] as Xenophon represents an important transition from Herodotus to the later Hellenistic and Roman historians.[114] Moreover, although Xenophon's fourth century BCE moral philosophy differs from many of Herodotus' didactic messages, certain themes from the *Histories*, such as the moral caution against human limits, appear to have influenced the work of Xenophon and other fourth century BCE historians.[115] Additionally, both Herodotus and Xenophon used the "principle of uncertainty" in their respective constructions of divine retribution; that is, neither Herodotus nor Xenophon make claims with certitude regarding the divine and its active participation in historical events.

---

[113] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 224.
[114] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 276.

Despite the obvious differences between the texts and their respective unique messages to a unique intended audience, common *topoi* also are evident. The central role of the divine, the divine safeguarding and protecting the social centre of a discourse, the successes and failures of individuals and society contingent upon proper moral conduct, the actions of impious people causing divine retribution, and the use of historical discourse for didactic purposes seem to be intercultural phenomena that pervade each of the texts examined above.

---

[115] Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 7.

3. Paradigmatic Individuals

This chapter considers how Chronicles, the Weidner Chronicle, Herodotus' *Histories*, and Xenophon's *Hellenica* use paradigmatic individuals to narrate lessons from the past to their respective intended audiences. In all four texts/traditions, paradigmatic individuals were employed to reinforce a social centre, as well as represent a microcosm through which the entire narrative could be understood by intended audiences.

Narratives which involve paradigmatic individuals are similar to what Bal calls "embedded texts". Bal expounds that "[t]he embedded story can explain the primary story, or it may resemble the primary story."[1] Moreover, embedded stories suggest how the primary text should be read. In Bal's words:

> The place of the embedded text—the mirror text—in the primary text determines its function for the reader. When the mirror-text occurs near the beginning, the reader may, on the basis of the mirror-text, predict the end of the primary fabula. In order to maintain suspense, the resemblance is often veiled. The embedded text will only be interpreted as mirror-text and 'give away' the outcome when the reader is able to capture the partial resemblance through abstraction. The abstraction resemblance, however, is usually only captured after the end, when we know the outcome. Thus suspense is maintained, but the prefiguring effect of the mirror-text is lost.[2]

Although paradigmatic individuals who appear early (or in some cases, earlier) in the narrative make the end of the primary story predictable, the meaning of the texts discussed below remains veiled, and the interpretive value of the paradigmatic individuals in these texts is revealed only when the outcome of the narrative (i.e. the conclusion of the narrative) is revealed.

---

[1] Bal, *Narratology*, 53.
[2] Bal, *Narratology*, 58.

3.1 Chronicles

Chronicles juxtaposes the idealized reigns of David and Solomon to the arch-villain Ahab in order to establish paradigms through which its intended audience was able to comprehend divine providence in 2 Chronicles 10-36. In other words, post-Solomonic kings follow the paradigm of David-Solomon or Ahab, or both at different times (eg. Jehoshaphat, Manasseh, and Josiah). These paradigms seem to be established through what Isaac Kalimi calls “antithesis”. In Kalimi’s words:

> Antithesis is a literary device used to draw lines of contrast between the deeds or fate (or other details) of two characters. There are instances in which changes made by the Chronicler created a contrast between the actions, way of life, fate, or power of gods, kings, leaders, and various ethnic groups in such a way that one of them served as a kind of ‘antitype’ to another.[3]

As will be illustrated below, the Jehoshaphat narrative in Chronicles antitypes the positive paradigm of David and Solomon with the negative paradigm of Ahab. Thus, it is the ambiguous reign of Jehoshaphat that juxtaposes the two paradigmatic patterns of behaviour.

According to Japhet, as individual characters, neither David nor Solomon is idealized in Chronicles, but when the two kings are united by one central idea, their combined reign becomes the golden era of Israelite history. David is not an idealized king because of two episodes, namely his ill-advised, disastrous census (1 Chronicles 21) and his failed transfer of the ark (13:6-13). Although a flawless king in Chronicles, Solomon is not fully idealized because some of his virtues and accomplishments (wisdom, organizational and administrative accomplishments, and his many building projects) from Kings are omitted, downplayed, or transferred to his father in Chronicles. But, as Japhet maintains, it is only when the two reigns are combined that an ideal reign/period is apparent.[4] While I agree with Japhet that the combined reign of David and Solomon is an idealized period of unprecedented greatness, I do not agree with her that Solomon is not "fully idealized" because some of his important duties from Kings are transferred to David in Chronicles. In my view, Solomon is a flawless and idealized king in Chronicles, since Solomon is the exemplar of a perfect king.

---

[3] Isaac Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 325.

The David-Solomon golden age lays the foundation for proper cultic behaviour, and thus becomes a model for all successive kings to follow. In other words, since David and Solomon personally and properly seek YHWH, they become a prototype for other kings, and Chronicles explicitly compares Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 17:3), Ahaz (28:1), Hezekiah (29:2), and Josiah (34.2-3) to David and/or Solomon.[5]

During the idealized period of the combined reigns of David and Solomon, Israel's proper YHWHistic cult is founded and the temple is built. In Chronicles, the reigns of David and Solomon parallel and complement each other, as "David is the founder and initiator, while Solomon is the executor and culminator of their shared period."[6] For instance, although Solomon builds the temple, David initiates its construction; he brings the ark from Kiriath-jearim and organizes worship at the tent which houses the ark (1 Chron. 13; 15:1-16:28), selects the temple site (21:18-22:1), and prepares the resources and labour necessary for the temple's construction (18:2-11; 22:2-5, 14-16; 29:2-9).[7] Moreover, the bloodshed which disqualifies David from building the temple himself provides Solomon with the rest and peace necessary to build it, and thus David makes a contribution to the construction of the temple in this regard as well.[8] It is important to mention that David's military campaigns also provide tribute and resources that go into the construction of the temple (18:2-11).

---

[4] Japhet, *Ideology*, 467-89.
[5] See Duke, "A Rhetorical Approach," 120-22.
[6] Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 10.

The House of Ahab represents the antithesis of David and Solomon. Ben Zvi maintains that "[t]he House of Ahab bears a paradigmatic, ideological status in Chronicles" and "… is construed as exerting some irrational attraction for Davides, even among the best of them (see, the extreme case of Jehoshphat)."[9] Ahab is a prominent figure and paradigm in Chronicles with his House being named after him, a House to which there are several explicit references (2 Chron. 21:6, 13; 22:3, 4-5, 7, 8) and "… whose very existence is a trap to the Davidic House that leads to sin and ruination."[10] As an individual, Ahab is a figurehead king for the illegitimate kingdom of Israel, which opposes YHWH and is home to an illegitimate and rival cult to that of Jerusalem; he is deceived by the words of 400 false prophets (2 Chron. 18:5, 21-22); he hates the one true prophet of YHWH in the narrative, Micaiah (18:7), and later ignores his prophecy (18:16) and imprisons him (18:26); finally, YHWH deceives Ahab in order to bring about his eventual demise and destruction (18:22, 33-34).

---

[7] See Japhet, *Ideology*, 226.

[8] Although David is disqualified from building the temple because he shed too much blood and waged too many wars (1 Chron. 22:8), his military campaigns and victories (14:10-17; 18:1-10; 19) are necessary for Solomon's "time of peace": "Behold, a son will be born to you; he will be a man of calm, and I will secure rest for him from all his enemies from all directions. For Solomon will be his name, and I will place political peace upon Israel in his days" (22:9).

[9] Ehud Ben Zvi, "The House of Omri/Ahab in Chronicles," *Forthcoming*, 2-3.

[10] Ben Zvi, "The House of Omri/Ahab in Chronicles," 7.

The legacy of Ahab and the House of Ahab is the virtual definition of impiety: when arch-villains in Chronicles, including Jehoram (2 Chron. 21:6, 13), Ahaziah (22:4), and perhaps the worst king of all, Ahaz (28:1-2), are evaluated, they are compared to kings of Israel or the House of Ahab, and they, like others who do evil in the sight of YHWH, are punished severely by YHWH—for instance, Jehoram dies a most painful death from an incurable bowel disease (21:18-19). Athaliah, a usurper and daughter of Ahab, attempts to abolish the Davidic line when she thinks she has killed off all the royal offspring. In fact, the status of the Jerusalem cult reaches an initial nadir under Athaliah as her sons break into the temple and use its holy things for the Baals (24:7). The ensuing chaos after the brief reign of Athaliah is so great that Joash, pious during the years of Jehoiada's life, fulfills the role of restorer of order and restores the temple (24:4-14).

Even if an impious king is not compared explicitly to Ahab, in my view, that king still follows the Ahab paradigm. Any king who does evil in the sight of YHWH, ignores the words of a prophet, mistreats a prophet, or endorses a rival cult or god follows the Ahab paradigm with such acts. Not surprisingly, these acts are met with divine retribution. Furthermore, impious kings who precede Ahab follow the Ahab paradigm. As discussed in Chapter 1, the order in which kings reigned and the length of each respective reign constituted a core fact that could not be changed (i.e., it was a limit in the formation of discourse). In other words, although paradigms often appear at the beginning of a narrative, core facts about the order of kings precluded the possibility of the negative paradigmatic figure of

Ahab being introduced earlier in the discourse. The figurehead of impiety, Ahab, can be retrojected as paradigmatic for the misdeeds of kings who precede him.

Jehoshaphat's reign oscillates between the David-Solomon and Ahab paradigms thereby juxtaposing the two paradigms. The beginning of Jehoshaphat's reign follows the David-Solomon paradigm; he has YHWH with him because he follows the examples of David and does not seek the Baals (17:2). Additionally, Jehoshaphat further establishes his piety when he dispatches people throughout all the cities of Judah to teach *torah*. As a result, Jehoshaphat receives divine favour and blessings including fortified cities (v. 2), tribute, great riches, and honour (vv. 5, 10-11), peace (v. 10), and building projects (v. 12). However, once Jehoshaphat allies himself with Ahab through marriage (18:1), the Judahite king nearly dies in a war, into which YHWH tricks Ahab so that he can destroy the Israelite king, only to be saved by YHWH when he cries for divine assistance (18:31). McKenzie summarizes the results of Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahab and its impact on later narratives, namely those in 2 Chron. 21:1-23:21, as well as the ambiguity it creates in the Jehoshaphat narrative, as follows:

> The reigns of Jehoram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah are best understood as a single story in Chronicles that traces the negative results of Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahab. All three monarchs are related to Ahab, king of Israel, and all three follow his (and Jezebel's) apostate ways. As a result, they lead Judah into idolatry and decline, ultimately endangering the Davidic line. All three die ignominiously and are not buried with their royal predecessors—a sign of the Chronicler's low esteem for them. An additional indication of the Chronicler's contempt for then is that he records no source citation for their reigns, in effect denying them any memorial. The problems caused by these three rulers account for the Chronicler's strong sense of ambiguity in his depiction of Jehoshaphat, who initiated the alliance with Israel that produced Jehoram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah.[11]

---

[11] S. L. McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles* (AOTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004), 300.

After Jehoshaphat's ill-fated and ill-advised alliance with the now deceased Ahab, he heeds a prophetic warning and begins to seek YHWH again (2 Chronicles 19). After re-establishing himself as a pious king, Jahaziel advises Jehoshaphat that YHWH will defeat his adversaries, a collective offensive by Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir, so there is no need to fight (2 Chron. 20:15-17). Jehoshaphat then tells Judah and Jerusalem to trust in YHWH and his prophets, and the king and the people praise YHWH as they watch the Ammon-Moab-Mount Seir coalition turn on each other and slaughter themselves until they all die (vv. 20-24). Thus, YHWH provides the pious Jehoshaphat with the divine blessing of a military victory, and once again, the Judahite king is rewarded with peace (v. 29).

However, the ambiguity of Jehoshaphat's reign continues. First, Jehoshaphat receives a mixed review of his overall performance—he did right by not departing from his father Asa but did not remove the high places because he had not directed the hearts of the people toward YHWH (20:32-33). Finally, Jehoshaphat foolishly re-allies himself with the kings of Israel, this time with Ahab's son Ahaziah, in order to make ships to go to Tarshish (v. 35). For this reason, Eliezer prophecies against Jehoshaphat and the ships are destroyed before they reach their destination (v. 37).

Chronicles' account of Jehoshaphat may be interpreted as a paradigm itself, as it is laden with ambiguities that juxtapose the David-Solomon and Ahab paradigms. The account of Jehoshaphat in Chronicles is much longer than that in

Kings, an expansion which makes room for the dichotomies in the narrative to unfold.

3.2 The Weidner Chronicle

Liverani states that "[t]he intelligentsia of ancient Mesopotamia had no doubt that the dynasty of Akkad, and its kings Sargon and Naram-Sin, represented a highly significant phase in the history of their country, and an obliged reference-point for later kings."[12] Speiser suggests that since Akkadian empire (2340-2159 BCE) stood out as a period of unprecedented achievement,[13] its formation and demise became a model for understanding the "ebb and flow" in the fortunes of empires; in other words, it became a system with which ancient Babylonian scribes could interpret history.[14] In other words, the kings of Akkad, Sargon and Naram-Sin, became models for kingship, or "prototypes" of behaviour to be imitated or avoided by later kings.[15] Finkelstein adds:

> The experience of a single dynasty, if it was of sufficient duration, and spectacular in its rise, its glories as well as its reverses and final demise, constituted, as it were, the complete requisite paradigm for the fortunes that any ruler or dynasty would be likely to encounter in the future. For the Mesopotamians, the fortunes of the Akkad dynasty served precisely as that paradigm.[16]

As discussed in Chapter 2, in Babylonian historical narratives, a victorious or prosperous king is a pious king who is the recipient of divine favour, while disaster is brought upon the land by an impious and unsuccessful king who is the recipient of divine retribution. Sargon, the founder of a dynasty, is favoured by the gods[17] while Naram-Sin is the *Unheilsherrscher*.[18]

---

[12] Mario Liverani, "Akkad: An Introduction," in M. Liverani (ed.), *Akkad, The First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions* (HANE/S V; Sargon, 1993), 1.

[13] The Akkadian empire was to later periods of Mesopotamian history what the Classical world was to Europe from the Renaissance to the modern era; that is, both the Akkadian empire and the Classical world were seen as periods of unrivalled achievement to which later people wanted to connect themselves and trace their intellectual origins.

[14] E.A. Speiser, "Ancient Mesopotamia," in R. Dentan (ed.), *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), 55.

[15] Mario Liverani, "Model and Actualization: The Kings of Akkad in the Historical Tradition," in *Akkad, The First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions*, 48.

[16] Finkelstein, "Mesopotamian Historiography," 466.

Kalimi's "antithesis" appears to be applicable to Sargon and Naram-Sin, as Mesopotamian scribes "antityped" them by removing sons Rimush (2239-2230 BCE) and Manishtushu (2229-2214 BCE) from the narrative. By presenting Naram-Sin as Sargon's immediate successor, the contrast, or "antitype", is heightened. Thus, through literary-chronological proximity[19] these two kings of Akkad became paradigmatic individuals through whom divine providence and historical causation could be comprehended. The Weidner Chronicle exhibits how Sargon and Naram-Sin function as paradigmatic individuals.

Referring to the Weidner Chronicle, Speiser states:

> But the bulk of the account concerns itself with the Dynasty of Sargon and the events before and after that period. Sargon was punctilious about cult and so he prospered. But Naram-Sin was hostile to the people of Babylon, thereby inviting divine retribution through the medium of the Gutian barbarians.[20]

Marduk elects, blesses, and rewards Sargon because he disregards Ur-Zababa's command to exchange the provisions for Esagil; Ur-Zababa commands him to bring the provision of wine instead of fish, but Sargon delivers the fish to Esagil

---

[17] See "'The Wisdom of Sargon': The 'Birth Legend' of Sargon," in Joan Goodnick Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 36-49; See also the "Sargon Chronicle" and "Sargon of Agade" in Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 266-68.

[18] For discussion on *Unheilsherrscher*, see O.R. Gurney, "The Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin," *Anatolian Studies* 5 (1955), 96; J.J. Finkelstein, "The So-Called 'Old Babylonian Kutha Legend'," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 11 (1957), 88; *idem*, Mesopotamian Historiography," 467.

Kuhrt comments on stories about Akkad that focus on Sargon as founder and his grandson, Naram-Sin, as the last ruler who brought the great empire to a catastrophic end. She notes that "[t]hese stories continued to circulate, and to be copied, reshaped and read well into the Hellenistic period." While they illustrate the ideological and symbolic importance of kings of Akkad, they, of course, cannot be considered reliable sources for historical reconstructions of the period. For instance, it is generally agreed that Naram-Sin was not the last king of the Akkadian dynasty (See Amelie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East: c. 3000-330 BC* [Routledge History of the Ancient World; 2 vols; New York: Routledge, 1995], I, 47).

[19] See Isaac Kalimi, "Literary-Chronological Proximity in the Chronicler's Historiography," *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (1993), 318-38.

[20] Speiser, "Ancient Mesopotamia," 59-60.

(46-47). As was discussed in Chapter 2, delivering the provision of fish for Esagil constitutes proper cultic behaviour. As a result, Sargon's piety is rewarded: "Marduk, 'son of the temple' of Apsu, looked with joy upon him and gave to him the sovereignty of the Four Quarters. To provide for Esagil, *bread for the shrines at* Babylon, his tribute…" (48-49). However, although Sargon displays piety and proper cultic behaviour, for which he is rewarded, his entire reign does not follow this pattern. Because Sargon builds a duplicate of Babylon in front of Agade (50-51), he subsequently is punished: "[Because of] the wrong he (Sargon) had done, he (Marduk) became hostile towards him (Sargon).[21] They (his subjects) rebelled against him from east to west. He was inflicted with insomnia" (52). Although Sargon also displays impiety, his piety and cultic observance are paradigmatic for a successful king in Babylonian historical narratives.

Naram-Sin, on the other hand, is exemplary of an unfortunate reign, as he is the classic *Unheilsherrscher*. The Curse of Akkad[22] was the first text to associate Naram-Sin, impiety, divine retribution, and the destruction of Akkad; the *hybristic* Naram-Sin, after not accepting an ominous dream about the destruction of Akkad, offends the gods by destroying Ekur. As a result, Naram-Sin arouses the wrath of Enlil, the head of the Sumerian pantheon, leading to the curse and destruction of Akkad.[23]

---

[21] The significance of this event will be discussed and compared with Chronicles in the context of the *topos* of the central cultic place in Chapter 4.

[22] The Curse of Akkad can be dated confidently as early as the Ur III Dynasty. For discussion on dating the Curse of Akkad, see Jerrold S. Cooper, *The Curse of Agade* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 11-12; *idem*, "Paradigm and Propaganda: The Dynasty of Akkade in the 21st Century," *Akkad, The First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions*, 16.

[23] For discussion on the Curse of Akkad see Cooper, *Curse of Agade*; *idem*, "Paradigm and Propaganda," 16-17; Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 25.

In the Weidner Chronicle, Naram-Sin destroys the population of Babylon (53) and Marduk twice punishes him by bringing the Guti against him (54). With Naram-Sin's impiety and demise comes the transfer of kingship from the Akkadian empire to the Gutians. Cooper outlines the relationship between the Curse of Akkad and the Weidner Chronicle:

> .... (The *Weidner Chronicle*) ends in unqualified disaster for him, and it is this fictional chronicle, among all the preserved Naramsin traditions, that presents an historical tradition of Naramsin as the king under whom Agade was destroyed, which is the tradition, in far more lavish form, of the *Curse of Agade*. The case in of Agade's destruction is also similar in both the *Curse of Agade* and the *Weidner Chronicle*: Naramsin destroys Ekur/Babylon, and Enlil/Marduk sends the Guti against Agade to avenge Naramsin's sacrilege.[24]

It is evident that the Weidner Chronicle used a previously established tradition and narrative pattern from an earlier Naram-Sin tradition; with Babylon and its cult at Esagil comprising the social centre of the Weidner Chronicle narrative, Babylon and Marduk were thrust into the centre of the existing narrative pattern.

3.3 The Histories

The encounter between Solon, the wise Athenian law-giver, and Croesus functions paradigmatically in the *Histories*. According to Arieti, Herodotus used the Solon- Croesus narrative to illustrate the ethical lessons he wished to impart.[25] In other words, Herodotus used the great Athenian law-giver to lay down the law which forms the social centre of the primary narrative, the law of the value of moderation. Thus, Herodotus had a great Athenian (i.e., a cultural authority) to teach the main message of the *Histories* to his late fifth century BCE Athenian intended audience. Additionally, the Solon-Croesus scene embodies "...

---

[24] Cooper, *Curse of Agade*, 17.

[25] James A. Arieti, *Discourses on the First Book of Herodotus* (Lanham, MD: Littlefield Adams Books, 1995), 44.

Herodotus' own views on both the relationship between gods and men and the nature of historical causation."[26]

In the Solon-Croesus narrative, Solon acknowledges that Croesus is a very wealthy man who rules over many peoples but advises him that plenty of wealthy people are unlucky and that many people of moderate means are lucky. Moreover, a lucky person is much better off since that person is safeguarded from disaster by his or her luck. In addition, also consistent with luck are good health, fine children,[27] good looks, and a heroic death. In this sense, Arieti contends that Croesus is juxtaposed with Tellus of Athens whom Solon considers the happiest person. Solon tells Croesus that Tellus had fine children and he lived to see his children grow up and have their own children, all of whom survived. Furthermore, Tellus had a good income and a glorious death, for which the Athenians awarded him with a public funeral on the spot where he died and greatly honoured him thereafter (1.30). Croesus dismisses Solon's account as nonsense, because, in his view, anyone who ignores such great wealth and power is a fool (1.33). After Solon's departure, Herodotus informs the reader, "… the weight of divine anger descended on Croesus, in all likelihood for thinking that he was the happiest man in the world" (1.33). Soon after, Croesus' beloved son dies (1.43) and, because he misinterprets the Delphic Oracle, his empire is toppled by the Persians in a war that he expected to win (1.71).

Arieti contends that no other character in the *Histories* achieves happiness which exceeds or equals that of Tellus. Additionally, Arieti states the following:

---

[26] Chiasson, "Herodotus' Use of Attic Tragedy," 6.

[27] Cf. Chronicles. In Chronicles, a multitude of children is considered a divine blessing.

"One might contrast Croesus with Tellus: Croesus's country will be overturned and become a vassal state in his lifetime; one of Croesus's sons is deaf and dumb, the other will die in his youth; and Croesus's end will be to serve a cruel master—the lunatic Cambyses."[28] In my view, it hardly is surprising that Herodotus would use an Athenian to act as the prototype for moderation and happiness and juxtapose him with an imperialist despot. Tellus represents Athens' pre-imperialist state whereas Croesus represents late fifth century BCE Athens (i.e., the *Histories'* intended audience). As pointed out in Chapter 2, Athens begins as a Tellus-like entity and becomes Croesus-like by the time Herodotus was writing the *Histories.* Thus, Herodotus' juxtaposition of Tellus and Croesus acted as mirror for his late fifth century BCE Athenian audience, whom he warned of a great fall at the hands of the gods, just as other imperialistic depots did before them, since human fortune is in flux. This paradigm established in the initial narrative of the primary narrative flows throughout the remainder of the primary narrative.

Herodotus suggests that human existence is in a state of flux; that is, human fortune never remains in one place for long, and as a result, the small may become mighty and the mighty may fall, particularly when those who have power become arrogant and are guilty of *hybris*.[29] In other words, change is inevitable and history illustrates this point many times.

> I will cover minor and major human settlements equally, because most of those which were important in the past have diminished in significance by now, and those which were great in my own time were small in times past. I will mention

---

[28] Arieti, *Discourses*, 47.
[29] Cf. 1 Sam. 2:3-8.

> both equally because I know that human happiness never remains long in the same place (1.5).[30]

Croesus, Cambyses, Polycrates, and Xerxes are all examples of individuals who wield great power, fortune, and wealth, only to meet an eventual downfall. Even Cyrus eventually meets his match! However, the Solon-Croesus and Xerxes narratives have a particularly intimate relationship. Croesus and Xerxes have much in common in that they both are destined to fall because of a combination of ancestral impiety[31] and their own imperialism (mainly against the Greeks) and *hybris*. Furthermore, because of ancestral impiety, both rulers are at the mercy of the gods, and therefore, are victims of fate, so much so that both Croesus (1.53) and Xerxes (7.12, 14, 19) are deceived by oracles/dreams. In this regard, Chiasson writes: "Xerxes' expedition against Greece represents the culmination of the Herodotean pattern, exemplified by Croesus, whereby a monarch suffers unwittingly self-inflicted defeat despite admonitions from gods (oracles, omens, dreams) and men (the cautious or 'tragic' advisor)."[32] Similarly, Evans states: "Like Croesus, only more so, Xerxes is the victim of self-delusion which is aided and abetted by supernatural power, and his *hybris* is more conspicuous than that of the Lydian king."[33] Thus, it seems as though Xerxes, like Croesus, was unable to escape his fate; that is, as a successor to the Persian throne, he was destined to be punished by the gods for the *hybris* of his predecessors, and eventually his own.[34]

---

[30] Cf. the Sumerian King List in which the single monarchy is in a state of flux moving from city to city.

[31] This will be explored in greater detail in Chapter 6.

[32] Chiasson, "Herodotus' Use of Attic Tragedy," 31.

[33] J.A.S. Evans, "Individuals in Herodotus," *Herodotus the Explorer: Three Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 63.

Harrison goes so far as to suggest that the *Histories* seem to be founded on the principle of the instability of human fortune.[35] The instability of human fortune, according to Herodotus, results from a combination of human excess and arrogance and divine jealousy. The theme of the instability of human fortune begins with Solon's speech to Croesus (1.32) and continues through to Amasis and Polycrates (3.40), Artabanus and Xerxes (7.10), and ends the book with Cyrus' advice to the Persians (9.122); the latter three, in one way or another, are built on the original "Solon-Croesus paradigm" from 1.32.[36] Thus, this core theme pervades Herodotus' entire work, from its introduction immediately following the proem (1.5) until Cyrus' closing remarks (9.122). Moreover, it is this central theme from the *Histories* that can bring a mighty empire to its knees, particularly when an individual or imperial force has reached his/her/its zenith in power. "Herodotus' belief in the divine cause of the instability of human fortune is certainly fundamental to his idea of 'history'."[37]

3.4 The Hellenica

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Xenophon used both paradigmatic communities and individuals to provide moral lessons and construct historical explanations, "as those places and persons are made to represent larger truths about the past."[38] The Thirty Tyrants of Athens and Jason of Pherae are two examples of paradigmatic individuals with which to understand the fall of Sparta in the primary narrative.

---

[34] The *topos* of the combination of both individual and collective retribution will be discussed in Chapter 6.
[35] Harrison, *Divinity and History*, 62.
[36] Harrison, *Divinity and History*, 62.
[37] Thomas Harrison, "Herodotus and the Certainty of Divine Retribution," in A.B. Lloyd (ed.), *What is a God?: Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1997), 111.

When one of their former members, Theramenes, voices dissent towards their policies, the Thirty condemn him to death. Theramenes takes sanctuary at an altar, but the impious Thirty have little problem removing him from the altar and carrying him to his death. After springing to the altar, Theramenes gives a speech which Xenophon uses to direct the readers' attention to the impiety of the Thirty: "By heaven… I am indeed aware that this altar is not going to help me, but I want to make this point too clear—that these people respect the gods no more than they do men" (2.3.53).[39] Not long after the Thirty's sanctuary violation the gods begin to oppose them by assisting their opponents. Xenophon twice mentions an unexpected snowstorm which protects Thrasybulus and his followers from the Thirty (2.4.3; 2.4.14), and Thrasybulus recognizes the divine forces at work in his favour: "And because of this the gods are quite evidently on our side now. In the middle of fair weather they send us a snowstorm to help us, and when we attack, few against many,[40] it is we who are granted the right to set up trophies" (2.4.14). As a result, Thrasybulus and his followers, with divine assistance, are victorious over the impious Thirty, who lose seventy supporters, including their leader (2.4.19).

---

[38] Dillery, *History of His Times,* 130.

[39] All quotes from the *Hellenica* are from *Xenophon: A History of My Times (Hellenica)* (Trans. Rex Warner. Toronto: Penguin Books Canada Ltd, 1979).

[40] Cf. 2 Chron. 13:13-17; 14:8-13; 20:15-24; 24:24; 32:1-21. Cf. Royal Assyrian Inscriptions. Liverani points out that Assyrian kings make their struggles as that of one against many. "The Assyrian king, alone, fights and overcomes enemies who are numerous, even numberless, all banded together against him" (Mario Liverani, "Kitru, kataru," *Mesopotamia* 17 [1982], 54).

Jason of Pherae is punished for the mere intention of robbing a temple. During the preparations for the Pythian festival, Jason's ambiguous intentions are interpreted by some Delphians as pre-meditated temple robbery.

> His intention, so they say, was to take personal charge both of the religious assembly and of the games. However, to this day no one knows what his intentions were with regard to the sacred treasure. It is said that when the people of Delphi asked the god what they should do if he tried to take any of the treasure, Apollo answered that he would look after the matter himself. (6.4.30)

Jason then is killed by some young men immediately after the accusations (6.4.31). Pownall perceives an association between crime (6.4.30) and punishment (6.4.31): "By including a full description of his assassination immediately after speculation upon his impiety, however, Xenophon strongly hints that Jason's alleged intended sacrilege regarding the sacred treasures at Delphi played a role in his untimely death."[41] Dillery provides a similar assessment: "… [Xenophon's] description of Jason's death offers positive confirmation that he believed that Jason desired control over Delphi's wealth… Jason's death is in part due to his coveting the wealth of Delphi, for the sentence is clearly linked to the oracle immediately preceding."[42]

Because of their impiety, the Thirty are punished by the gods (2.4.3, 14, 19) and are a paradigm through which the demise of Sparta can be comprehended.

---

[41] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 267.

Comparably, Chronicles uses literary-chronological proximity to draw a direct association between crime and punishment in Sennacherib's death in 2 Chron. 32:21—associating Sennacherib's crime against YHWH and Jerusalem and his punishment: "And YHWH sent an angel, who cut off all the mighty warriors and commanders and officers in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned with shame of face to his own land. And when he came into the house of his god, some of his own sons struck him down there with the sword" (32:21). Kalimi illustrates the distinction between Chronicles' account of Sennacherib's death and that of 2 Kgs 19:36-37: "The Deuteronomistic historian does not, in fact, link these two events explicitly… The message that the Deuteronomistic historian tried to inculcate covertly "between the lines" into the minds of his potential readers was conveyed by the Chronicler overtly. He linked Sennacherib's embarrassing return from Judah with his assassination in Nineveh, and presented the two events as a single unit…"[41] (Kalimi, "Literary-Chronological Proximity," 335).

[42] Dilley, *History of His Times,* 174.

Similarly, Xenophon used Jason of Pherae as a paradigm to teach and explain to his intended audience the fall of Sparta; like Sparta, Jason is impious, imperialistic, greedy, and lacks self-control, all of which violate the social centre of the *Hellenica.* Xenophon taught his intended audience that Jason was a man who sought too much power and died via divine retribution for coveting Delphi's wealth.[43] Sparta, the Thirty, and Jason of Pherae epitomize the undesirable characteristics associated with an imminent fall. "An all-powerful and providential divine sees to it that the impiety and lawlessness of those who seek hegemony will be punished by their folly. The story of the Thirty at Athens and Jason of Pherae, and especially the story of Sparta's rise and fall, bear out this simple truth."[44]

3.5 Analysis

The above examples illustrate that the primary narrative of a text may be interpreted through paradigmatic individuals or embedded texts. Paradigmatic individuals appear at the beginning of the primary narrative in Chronicles (the positive paradigmatic individuals), the Weidner Chronicle, and the *Histories*. However, paradigmatic individuals in the *Hellenica* do not appear until Books 2 and 6, just as the negative paradigm of Ahab does not appear until later in the narrative, at about the halfway mark of 2 Chronicles. Perhaps limitations in the creation of discourse, that is, core facts, prevented these later paradigms from manifesting earlier in the primary narrative. As mentioned above, I think it is possible to retroject later manifesting paradigms to explain earlier events.

---

[43] Dillery, *History of His Times,* 171-76.

[44] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 242.

Furthermore, paradigmatic individuals in Chronicles, the Weidner Chronicle, and the *Histories* may be used to interpret events throughout the remainder of the primary narrative, and in Chronicles and the *Histories*, paradigmatic individuals are used to interpret the central events at the end of the narrative. The *Hellenica* also is unique in this regard. For instance, the paradigmatic narrative about Jason of Pherae occurs in Book 6, which of course follows the central event in the *Hellenica*, the fall of Sparta. Thus, the central event does not occur at the end of the primary narrative and precedes a paradigm through which it may be interpreted. Once again, retrojection may be used in such instances.

Finally, one may observe that in all four discourses the negative paradigmatic individuals transgress and violate the social centre of the narrative by committing acts of sacrilege and/or *hybris*, for which they are punished with divine retribution. The guilty are punished either by a military defeat (Naram-Sin, Croesus, Xerxes, and the Thirty) or punished by death (Ahab and Jason of Pherae). Moreover, Ahab, Croesus, and Xerxes are deceived by some sort of oracle—Ahab by false prophets, Croesus by misinterpreting the Delphic oracle, and Xerxes by divinely sent misleading dreams. Interestingly, both Ahab and Xerxes are deceived intentionally by the divine in order to bring about their respective demises in the narrative, and in both cases the deceived party goes contrary to the admonition of a prophetic figure/wise advisor—Ahab disregards Micaiah's true prophecy and Xerxes' actions go against Artabanus' original warnings. In both instances, the ill-fated king has to ignore the wise advice because a divine force had pre-determined his fate. It is worth noting that this *topos* is not limited to ancient Israelite and Greek traditions, as is evident from the "Naram-Sin traditions". As discussed above, in the Curse of Akkad, Naram-Sin refuses to accept a dream and reacts to the dream by committing acts of *hybris* and sacrilege. In another Naram-Sin tradition, the Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin, Akkad is invaded by divinely created "[w]arriors with the bodies of 'cave-birds', a race with raven faces" (line 31). Naram-Sin twice ignores divine will by not heeding oracles, and as a result the Akkadian army is annihilated and the land and its people suffer greatly. However, when Naram-Sin finally heeds the prophetic word in the third instance, he defeats his enemies and preserves his kingdom,[45] experiencing success in a manner similar to that of characters who heed prophetic admonitions in Chronicles and the *Histories* and most often meet with political and/or military success—this will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

---

[45] See Gurney, The Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin," 93-111; Finkelstein, "The So-Called 'Old Babylonian Kutha Legend'," 83-88; "'Naram-Sin and the Enemy Hordes': The 'Cuthean Legend' of Naram-Sin," in Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, 263-331; Tremper Longman III, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography: A Generic and Comparative Study* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1991), 103-17.

4. Central City and Legitimate Cultic Place[1] in Chronicles and Babylonian Historical Narratives

Liverani states that there usually is opposition between nearby or central place and far-off or peripheral space—positive connotations to the former and negative to the latter.[2] He adds that the spatial pattern of the type illustrated above is linked to the centre of the world being in a great city. "The latter is normally the political and cultic center of the community which upholds the conception (e.g. Babylon, Jerusalem); a fact which makes the idea of the extension of the umbilical function from national to cosmic a reasonable one in the eyes of the internal public."[3] This narrative structure is evident in the representations in ancient Near Eastern literature of cities like Ashur, Babylon, and Jerusalem, and their respective cults. For instance, Assyrians used Ashur's central position to justify war against that which lay outside of Ashur.

> From the Assyrian viewpoint, outside the Assyrian imperial order there are but chaos and disturbances... and war is conceived to be not an antonym to peace but a prerequisite for peace. Disorder is the true contrast and alternative to peace. War is a matter of rehabilitation and restitution and is conducted with the proper intention of creating renewed stability.[4]

In both Chronicles and Babylonian historical narratives, a central city and its cult are centripetal structures (i.e., part of White's social centre) in the narrative. In both traditions, the centre represents order, which can be violated by chaotic forces from the outside, or periphery, by the likes of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Chronicles 36) or the Gutians in Babylonian historical narratives.

---

[1] Following Smith, I use the term "place" instead of "space" because "place" has a more intimate meaning than does the abstract "space". Think of sayings like "there is no place like home" in contrast to space which denotes emptiness, abstractness, and strangeness. The central place in these traditions and texts symbolize home and hearth (intimacy) whereas space is that void which lies outside of place. See Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 28-29.

[2] Liverani, "Memorandum," 189.

[3] Liverani, "Memorandum," 189.

[4] Bustenay Oded, *War, Peace and Empire: Justifications for War in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1992), 108.

4.1 Persian Yehud and Samaria

In terms of culture, Yehud and Samaria shared a great deal in common, and perceived differences or dichotomies probably were more administrative and political than cultural.[5] For instance, proper names on bullae, coins, and papyri, being indicative of religious affiliation, suggest that the majority of fourth century BCE Samarians, or at least the majority of the elite, were indeed Yahwistic.[6] Furthermore, in light of evidence of Yahwistic temples in Idumea, at Elephantine, and on Mount Gerizim, Lemaire points out "… the fact that it is no longer possible to speak about the Yahwistic cult during the Persian Period by taking into account only the Temple of Jerusalem."[7]

Chronicles challenged the legitimacy of the Northern kingdom and its cult, despite the fact that the Persian provinces of Yehud and Samaria were Yahwistic and shared common cultural traits. Knoppers suggests that the similarities between the Yahwists in the two provinces may have necessitated attempts at self-definition by the literati in Jerusalem. Knoppers adds that "[i]f, as recent excavations suggest, some sort of sanctuary or temple existed on Mt. Gerizim already during the Persian Period, this would only have added further impetus for Jerusalem temple scribes to authenticate the distinctive positions of their city and shrine."[8] Magen has unearthed an older layer, which he dates to the fifth century BCE, beneath the Hellenistic sacred precinct on Mount Gerizim. Evidence of a Persian period temple at Mount Gerizim suggests that Jerusalem faced a substantial cultic rival to the north as early as the fifth century BCE.[9]

---

[5] Gary N. Knoppers, "Revisiting the Samarian Question in the Persian Period," *Judah and Judeans in the Persian Period*, 279.

[6] Knoppers, "Revisiting the Samarian Question," 277.

[7] André Lemaire, "New Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea and Their Historical Interpretation," in *Judah and Judeans in the Persian Period*, 417.

Since Chronicles most likely was composed during the late Persian or early Hellenistic period, the existence of a rival cult at Mount Gerizim during the Persian and Hellenistic periods is significant; that is, if Yahwistic communities existed in both Yehud and Samaria during the Persian and Hellenistic periods, and if each province had its own Yahwistic sanctuary, cultic relations between the two communities, as well as self-identity and legitimacy, may have been issues for some community members, namely the Jerusalem literati. Chronicles, as well as Ezra-Nehemiah, seems to attest to this fact. According to Knoppers, Yahwists in both Yehud and Samaria probably laid claim to the same roots and may have agreed upon some aspects of religious devotion, including the principles of one god, one people, and one sanctuary; however, the location of the one legitimate sanctuary seems to have been a divisive issue for some Jerusalem elite, including the communicator of Chronicles.[10] In other words, the Chronicles' present shaped its narrative of the past. Knoppers notes that "... the Chronistic depiction of relations between the northern kingdom and the southern kingdom cannot be divorced from the relations between Samaria and Yehud in the author's own time. One inevitably affected the other."[11]

---

[8] Knoppers, "Revisiting the Samarian Question," 279. See

[9] Gary N. Knoppers, "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion: A Study in the Early History of Samaritans and Jews," *Studies in Religion* 34.3/4 (2005), 312-13.

[10] Knoppers, "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion," 325.

4.2 Jerusalem and its Cult in Chronicles

Kalimi contends that "Jerusalem is depicted by the Chronicler... as an absolutely theocratic city, 'the City of God/the Lord' in the full sense of the word, *more so than any other biblical work*."[12] In Chronicles, there is an intimate relationship between YHWH, the Davidic dynasty, cultic life, and Jerusalem. Kalimi notes that out of the 65 chapters in Chronicles, 56 deal directly with Davidic kings (1 Chronicles 11-2 Chronicles 36). Additionally, 1 Chronicles 3, which lists the children of David, the kings of the Davidic dynasty, and royal lineage, should be included as well. "This means that about 85% of the book is connected somehow with kings who reigned in Jerusalem. Almost 32 chapters, that is, nearly 50% of the entire composition, are associated somehow with the Temple, which was founded in the heart of the city."[13] The only legitimate kings are the Davidic descendants who rule YHWH's kingdom from his divinely elected city, Jerusalem (1 Chron. 28:5; 2 Chron. 13:5, 8), and it is within the temple of this central city that YHWH dwells (1 Chron. 28:2; 2 Chron. 6:6, 41; 7:12, 16; 33:7). However, unlike the partially transferable Davidic kingship (1 Chron. 28:9; 2 Chron. 7:17-20), the divine election of Jerusalem is unconditional and eternal. For instance, after Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, the kingship is partially transferred over to Cyrus but Jerusalem remains the divinely elected city (2 Chron. 36:23).[14]

---

[11] Knoppers, "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion," 315.
[12] Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite Historian*, 126-27. My emphasis.
[13] Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite Historian*, 137.

In Chronicles, the antithesis to Jerusalem's central and legitimate cultic place is the peripheral and illegitimate cultic spaces of the Northern kingdom. Unless they interact with Davidic kings (2 Chronicles 10; 13; 18; 20:25-27), Chronicles excludes the Northern kings because the Samarian kings, their kingdom, and their cult are illegitimate. However, in Chronicles, it seems to be only the Northern kingdom and cult, and not the people, that are polluted, as pious people are permitted to leave Samaria to worship YHWH properly in Jerusalem.

> And the priests and the Levites, who were in all Israel, served him from all territories. For the Levites had left their pasture lands and properties, and they went to Judah and Jerusalem, because Jeroboam and his sons excluded them from the priesthood of YHWH. He set up priests for himself at the high places, for the satyrs, and for the young bulls that he had made. And after them, from all the tribes of Israel, those who gave their hearts to seek YHWH the god of Israel; and they came to Jerusalem to sacrifice to YHWH the god of their fathers. They strengthened the kingdom of Judah, and they strengthened Rehoboam, son of Solomon, for three years, for they walked in the way of David and Solomon for three years. (2 Chron. 11:13-17)
>
> And Hezekiah sent to all Israel and Judah, and he also wrote letters to Ephraim and Manasseh to come to the house of YHWH in Jerusalem to celebrate pesah to YHWH god of Israel. Then the king, his princes, and all members of the assembly in Jerusalem decided to celebrate pesah in the second month. For they had not been able to celebrate it in its time, because the priests had not sufficiently kept themselves in a state of ritual purity, nor had the people assembled in Jerusalem. And the affair was right in the eyes of the king and all the members of the assembly. So they set forth a decree to announce a proclamation in all Israel, from Beer-Sheba as far as Dan, to come and celebrate pesah to YHWH the god of Israel in Jerusalem, because as it is written, they had not celebrated in such great numbers. The messengers went through all Israel and Judah with letters from the king and his princes, just as the king commanded saying: "Children of Israel, return to YHWH the god of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel so that he may return to those of you who escaped capture from the palm of the hand of the kings of Assyria. (2 Chron. 30:1-6).

Chronicles shows that there are both pious and impious people in the North and the South. For instance, Northern prophetic figures such as Elijah (2 Chron.

---

[14] See Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite Historian*, 129.

21:12-15) and Oded (28:9-13), similar to their Southern counterparts, deliver the word of YHWH when they warn and exhort. Interestingly, the prophetic Elijah warns an impious Southern king, Jehoram, who does not heed the Northern prophet's advice and subsequently is destroyed (21:16-19). Importantly, when Oded addresses the Samarian army, he refers to YHWH as the god of their fathers: "Behold, because the wrath of the god of Abraham is against Judah, he gave them into your hand, but you have caused a slaughter among them in a rage, which has touched as far as heaven" (28:9).

In contrast to Jehoram's disregard of divine word, the Samarian army heeds the advice of the prophetic figure (28:14-15). Furthermore, because the Samarian army follows the ways of YHWH, they exhibit greater piety than the South during Ahaz'a reign in 2 Chronicles 28. Thus, Chronicles exhibits that both Northerners and Southerners are people of YHWH.[15] Ben Zvi concludes that "[t]he text indicates that no Israelite should reject the exclusivity of the Jerusalem temple, its personnel and associated elite, to do so is to reject the legitimate worship of YHWH, and so, to reject YHWH…."[16]

Israelites who reject the legitimate worship of YHWH and the exclusivity of Jerusalem are punished. For instance, Abijah warns Jeroboam that a campaign against Jerusalem is equivalent to an attack on YHWH: "Behold, God is at the head of us, and his priests and trumpets to raise the war-cry against you. Children of Israel, do not make war with YHWH the god of your ancestors, for you will not be successful" (13:12). Jeroboam, of course, does not heed Abijah's advice, and consequently YHWH slaughters the Northern army (13:15-17) and kills the Northern king (13:20). Thus, Jeroboam is punished for not acknowledging the exclusivity of Jerusalem and its temple (11:13-17) and the legitimacy of the Davidic kings (13:5, 8), as well as for waging a futile war against YHWH (13:12).[17] The failure of an enemy to recognize a divine sovereign and a proper cult, and the subsequent futile war between an impious enemy and a god is also found in Royal Assyrian Inscriptions.

---

[15] Ben Zvi, "Gateway," 237-38.

[16] Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Secession of the Northern Kingdom in Chronicles: Accepted 'Facts' and New Meanings," *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*, 78.

> When war is justified as punishment of the criminal… or to restore order… the enemy is the foe of the people and mankind… He is the enemy of the country. The crime is essentially in the sphere of religion, when the enemy sinned against the gods; the war is against the enemy of the gods, the god Ashur in particular… The enemy's malfeasance triggers the god's vengeance.[18]

And, of course, the result in Royal Assyrian Inscriptions is similar to that in Chronicles; the divine sovereign, in this case, Ashur, annihilates the enemy.

Another way in which Chronicles exhibits the exclusiveness of Jerusalem is by making YHWH emphatically responsible for the schism of the united monarchy (2 Chron. 10:15), an event which is caused by Solomon's apostasy and idolatry (1 Kgs 11:11) and YHWH (1 Kgs 12:24) in Kings. Because YHWH alone is explicitly responsible for the schism in Chronicles, no Judahite king is permitted to annex the Northern kingdom. For instance, Shemaiah warns Rehoboam not to attack Jeroboam and the Northern kingdom (2 Chron. 11:4); no pious Judahite king can go contrary to the will of YHWH by attempting to negate the schism through annexation.

---

[17] Ben Zvi, "Secession of the Northern Kingdom," 78-79.
[18] Oded, *War, Peace and Empire*, 124.

Abijah, Hezekiah, and Josiah may be interpreted as pious kings with opportunity to annex the Northern kingdom. With a convincing defeat over the Northern army and a weakened Jeroboam (13:15-19), Abijah has plenty of opportunity to annex the North, but does not. Hezekiah defeats Sennacherib (32:21-22) and is exalted before the nations (32:23); this suggests that he also possessed the ability to annex the Northern kingdom, but he does not. Instead Hezekiah invites pious people from the Northern kingdom to worship YHWH properly and participate in the Passover (30:1-9). Finally, if Hezekiah and Josiah possess the ability to remove and destroy improper altars and cultic objects in the North (31:1; 34:6-7), then one would expect that they too possess the ability to annex the North. For Chronicles, this is because the Northern kingdom is illegitimate and lies beyond the true centre of the kingdom of YHWH, Jerusalem. It is YHWH's will which separates the two kingdoms and pious Judahite kings must seek YHWH by following his will.[19]

The *topos* of divinely determined geopolitical borders is not too dissimilar to that found in Royal Assyrian Inscriptions; like YHWH in Chronicles, the god Ashur established Assyria's borders with its neighbours. In this regard, Oded writes: "The gods demarcated the boundaries… By transgressing… the Assyrian borders, the enemy violated the Assyrian right to possess the land that the gods allotted to the Assyrian people. The transgressor sinned against the gods who are the guardians of the borders, thereby becoming at the same time an enemy of the gods."[20] The key difference between divinely determined borders in Chronicles and Royal Assyrian Inscriptions is that YHWH does not expand Judah's/Yehud's borders whereas the god Ashur constantly is expanding Assyria's borders.

---

[19] Ben Zvi, "Secession of the Northern Kingdom," 82-86.
[20] Oded, *War, Peace and Empire*, 56.

In sum, Chronicles taught its intended audience that the antithesis to Jerusalem's central and legitimate cultic place is Shechem's peripheral and illegitimate cultic space and that the schism of the two kingdoms is YHWH's will, so that the two regions should remain separate, and therefore no political alliances should be made between Yehud and Samaria.[21] Furthermore, Chronicles instructed its community that kings of Samaria were illegitimate, and the only legitimate kings were from the Davidic dynasty. However, Chronicles also taught that all of Israel are people of God, as only the cult, and not the people, of Samaria is polluted and profane and that pious people from Samaria are permitted to worship YHWH properly in Jerusalem (2 Chron. 11:13-17; 21:12-15; 28:9-13). In Knoppers' words, "[t]he Jerusalem temple appears as an instrument of unity, rather than of division, in the life of the people."[22]

4.3 Babylon and its Cult in Babylonian Historical Narratives

The primacy of Babylon within Babylonian historical narratives is evident in many of the texts that have been discussed above. Babylon to the Babylonian scribes, like Jerusalem in Chronicles, was a central and sacred place. Any neglect or mistreatment of Babylon, its patron god, or its people, makes a king liable to divine retribution from Marduk: "who commits sin against the gods of that city, his star will not *stand* in heaven… *They will not have* a king, his scepter will be taken away, his treasury will become a ruin" (Weidner Chronicle, *ABC* 19:27-28).

---

[21] See Ben Zvi, "Secession of the Northern Kingdom," 85.

[22] Knoppers, "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion," 325.

Criminal acts against, or mistreatment of, Babylon and its people, leads to divine retribution. Shulgi mistreats Babylon and its cultic centre when he takes away the property of Esagil and Babylon as booty, an act which brings about his demise (Chronicle of Early Kings, *ABC* 20 A 28-30). Tukulti-Ninurta commits crimes against Babylon, and as a result he is killed by his own people, including his son (Chronicle P, *ABC* 22 iv 3-11). In the Weidner Chronicle, Naram-Sin destroys the population of Babylon (*ABC* 19:53) for which Marduk twice punishes him by bringing the Guti against him (54), and Utu-hegal mistreats Babylon and is drowned in the Euphrates as divine punishment (62). Thus, any challenge to, or violation of, Babylon's sacred place results in Marduk's wrath.

In Babylonian historical narratives, complete adherence to Babylon and its cult is imperative; that is, if a king worships or establishes a cult elsewhere, divine retribution ensues. For instance, Sargon is punished by Marduk for removing soil from Babylon so that he could build a replica of the great city.

> He dug up the dirt of the pit of Babylon and made a counterpart next to Agade. Because of the wrong he had done the great lord Marduk became angry and wiped out his people by famine. They (his subjects) rebelled against him from east to west and he (Marduk) afflicted [him] with insomnia (Chronicle of the Early Kings *ABC* 20 A 18-23; cf. Weidner Chronicle, *ABC* 19:50-52).

Similarly, in the Cyrus Cylinder, since there can be only one legitimate place of worship, which is of course Esagil in Babylon, Marduk disposes of Nabonidus in favour of Cyrus because the Chaldean king establishes an illegitimate cultic space that imitates Esagil.

> An incompetent person was installed to exercise lordship over his country… An imitation of Esagila he ma[de?], rituals [ ], for Ur and the rest of the sacred centers, improper rituals [ ] daily he recited. Irreverently, he put an end to the regular offerings; he [ ] established in the sacred centers. By his own plan, he did away with the worship of Marduk, the kings of the gods; he continually did

> evil against his (Marduk's) city… Upon (hearing) their cries, the lord of the gods became furiously angry [and left] their borders.[23]

4.4 Analysis

Sargon's and Nabonidus' impious actions resemble those of Samaria and its kings in Chronicles; that is, in both traditions, an attempt is made to create and establish a space which rivals the central and legitimate cultic place (i.e., sacred place) in the narrative. As is evident with the polemic against the Samarian kings and cult and Sargon and Nabonidus and their rival cults/cities, the central and only legitimate place in the narrative is not to be rivaled. However, in my view, despite the similarities, important differences are evident, as well.

Chronicles used the spatial polemic to legitimize its community institutions in a manner different than that of the aforementioned Babylonian historical narratives. Chronicles established and emphasized cultic continuity between the tenth century (i.e., the golden age of David and Solomon) and Persian Yehud, and therefore, legitimized the cultic practices of fourth century BCE Jerusalem. If proper cultic life was abandoned by Jeroboam and the Northern kingdom in the late tenth century, "… this reflected poorly on [Samaria] and any claims that the Samarians might have of cultic continuity with the time of Israel's national beginnings." Additionally, unless the Levites and priests expelled by Jeroboam were restored to the region, a claim not made by Chronicles, Samarian cults lacked the proper divinely sanctioned personnel to administer their own sacred affairs.[24] Knoppers posits that "[b]oth northern and southern communities have links to the era of Israel's national beginnings; but, from the Chronicler's perspective, the Judean authorities are entrusted with authority to perpetuate, interpret and apply the mandate of old."[25]

---

[23] Translation from Mordechai Cogan, "Cyrus Cylinder (2.124)," in W.W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World* (3 vols; Leiden: Brill, 2003), II, 315.
[24] Knoppers, "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion," 318.

According to Al-Rawi, the Weidner Chronicle, possibly a letter from a king of Isin to a king of Babylon, is advice given by the author(s) to the addressee "... as to how to keep Babylon under his control, by not interfering with ritual offerings; and thereby give legitimation to the fixed offerings of Esagil."[26] The Cyrus Cylinder, on the other hand, is blatant pro-Cyrus propaganda, as it patterned Cyrus after Aššurbanipal and presented the Persian conqueror as a legitimate king of Babylon.[27]

---

[25] Knoppers, "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion," 319.
[26] Al-Rawi, "Tablets from the Sippar Library," 1-2.
[27] See Kuhrt, "Cyrus Cylinder," 83-97.

5. Restorer of Order in Ancient Near Eastern Historical Discourses

The description in Chronicles of Hezekiah's cultic reform and restoration which follow Ahaz's disastrous reign and the divine election of Cyrus to rebuild the temple and restore the cult of YHWH in Jerusalem follows Liverani's "restorer of order" narrative pattern.[1] Just as Hezekiah and Cyrus restore order in Chronicles, Cyrus restores order to Babylon after Nabonidus' reign in the Cyrus Cylinder, and Esarhaddon restores order in Babylon in the "Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon" following Sennacherib's destruction of the city.[2]

This chapter compares Ahaz's and Cyrus' respective roles as restorers of order in Chronicles to those of Cyrus in the Cyrus Cylinder and Verse Account of Nabonidus, and Esarhaddon in the Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon. It is my contention that the roles of characters presented as restorers of order in ancient Near Eastern historical narratives should not be evaluated only from the perspective of historicity. These accounts contribute very little to the most likely reconstruction of events during the reigns of individual kings but rather these narratives, as well as the characters involved in these narratives, follow a specific pattern. In other words, the restorer of order narrative pattern tells the modern reader more about how external referents were presented to intended audiences via an accepted form of discourse than it does about the events themselves. This being said, these texts also tell us very little about the kings who precede the restorer of order, since an unsuccessful and impious king is needed to create chaos before the reign of the restorer of order. Restorer of order narratives tell us more about propaganda and the presentation of good and bad PR than they do about the historicity of good and bad kings.

---

[1] See Liverani, "Memorandum," 186-88.
[2] See Liverani, "Memorandum," 186-88.

5.1 Hezekiah in Chronicles

Kalimis's "Antithesis" seems to be at work in the Ahaz and Hezekiah narratives; the former, of course, follows the Ahab paradigm and the latter, the David-Solomon paradigm. In 2 Chronicles 28, Ahaz, the worst king in Chronicles, does not follow the ways of David but walks in the ways of the kings of Israel (vv. 1-2), commits cultic abominations (vv.2-4, 23-25), suffers military defeats (vv. 5-8, 17-18, 20), does not seek YHWH (v. 16, 19, 21-23), and commits crimes against the temple – he steals from it (v. 21), cuts up its vessels (v.24), and shuts its doors (v.24).

At the beginning of the Ahaz narrative, it becomes clear that Ahaz follows the Saul paradigm because he is not like David: "And he had not done what was right in the eyes of YHWH, *like David his father*" (28:1). Furthermore, Ahaz seeks a force other than YHWH (v.16) and suffers subsequent military defeats (vv. 17-18, 20).[3] Additionally, because of Ahaz's impiety, the Philistines enjoy military success, which results in Philistine settlements in Judahite cities (v. 18). Finally, just as the state of the temple reached a nadir because of Jehoshaphat's marriage alliance with Ahab (2 Chron. 21:1-23:21), cult and temple reach a nadir during Ahaz's reign when the king steals from the temple to bribe the Assyrians (28:21), commits idolatry (vv. 23-25), and damages temple vessels and shuts the doors of the temple (v. 24).

---

[3] This is a common *topos* in prophetic literature. Cf. Hos. 5:13-14; 7:11-12; 8:9-10; 10:6; 11:5-6 (*NASB*).

Such acts, of course, "undo" some of the great deeds of David and Solomon. Ben Zvi observes that "[t]hese actions of Ahaz set the scene for the subsequent narrative, the re-opening of the Temple,[4] the re-inauguration of worship in the opening days of Hezekiah's rule, and the celebration of the event with a great festival, either Pesach or Succoth."[5]

The pious Hezekiah, who follows the David-Solomon paradigm, immediately follows Ahaz and reestablishes the proper Jerusalem cult. Thus, he acts as a restorer of order: "And he did what was right in the eyes of YHWH, *according to all that David his father had done*. In the first year of his reign, in the first month, *he opened the doors of the house of YHWH, and repaired them*" (2 Chron. 29:2). Hezekiah follows in the ways of David as he reopens and repairs the doors of the temple, which Ahaz had closed; he also assembles the priests and Levites and asks them to purify themselves and carry away the desecration from the sanctuary, and exhorts the people to seek YHWH.

Additionally, Hezekiah encourages people from both the North and the South to worship YHWH properly in Jerusalem and eliminate improper cultic objects and practices (30:1-31:1). In fact, Hezekiah's cultic reforms and pesah are such a success that he receives great praise: "And there was great jubilation in Jerusalem. *For since the days of Solomon the son of David king of Israel there had been nothing like this in Jerusalem*" (30:26). In other words, Hezekiah momentarily recaptures some of the glory of Israel's golden age. Hezekiah, like David and Solomon, personally and properly seeks YHWH, which makes him a very successful king: "And all the work that he began in the service of the house of God and with the *torah* and the commandments by seeking his god, he did with all his heart and was successful" (2 Chron. 31:21; cf. 32:27-30).

---

[4] Ben Zvi notes that 2 Kings mentions neither Ahaz closing the doors of the temple nor Hezekiah reopening them and reestablishing the cult ("Gateway," 229, *n.*28).
[5] Ben Zvi, "Gateway," 228-29.

Finally, in 2 Chronicles 32, Sennacherib comes against Jerusalem, and Hezekiah, following the ways of David, seeks YHWH instead of opting for human assistance, such as a medium (Saul in 1 Chron. 10:13) or a foreign army (Ahaz; see above) (vv. 7-8, 20-22). Because, Hezekiah, like David, seeks YHWH to defeat a military foe, he, like Solomon, is rewarded with a time of peace with rest from his enemies (v. 22). As during the reigns of David and Solomon, many people bring gifts to YHWH to Jerusalem and precious things to Hezekiah, so that he is exalted before all nations (v. 23).[6]

5.2 Cyrus in Chronicles

Chronicles' depiction of the destruction of the temple and Cyrus' election in 2 Chronicles 36 is a classic example of the restorer of order narrative pattern. Zedekiah, the final impious ruler of Judah, is the failed king who represents chaos when Jerusalem is razed and the temple is destroyed by the Chaldeans (36:16-19). Cyrus, acting as a restorer of order, is elected by YHWH to rebuild the temple.

> Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, to fulfill the word of YHWH by the mouth of Jeremiah, YHWH excited the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, and he made a proclamation in all his kingdom and even in writing saying: "Thus says Cyrus king of Persia, 'YHWH god of heavens has given me all the kingdoms of the land, and he, he has commanded me to build him a house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whoever is among you of all his people, YHWH his god is with him. Let him go up.'" (2 Chron. 36:22-23)

---

[6] For a discussion on Hezekiah, David, and Solomon in Chronicles, see Mark A. Throntveit, "The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Books of Chronicles," in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*, 105-21.

Thus, Cyrus restores the order which began with the building of the temple during the reigns of David and Solomon.[7]

Liverani presents two models of the restorer of order narrative pattern. The first is a cyclical time construction in which a positive past is followed by a negative present that is followed by a positive future.[8] However, Cyrus' role as a restorer of order in Chronicles seems to fit better in Liverani's second model:

> In this pattern the sequence of the qualities of time is the usual one (good-bad-good), but the subject seems to have moved one step further in the sequence. The happy past is pushed back into a more remote past, a veritable mythical age, and its function of ideal model of a corrected situation is underscored. The phase of corruption and chaos is over, i.e. moved from the present to a nearby past, just finished; while the second stage of order and prosperity is moved ahead from the future to the present.[9]

Chronicles presented a history to its intended audience in which David and Solomon represented a remote ideal past in which order (i.e., the temple) is first established, the post-Solomonic kings and the destruction of the temple a nearby past of chaos and corruption, and Persian Yehud setting the foundation for a second stage of prosperity and order. Kalimi asserts: "… the Chronicler states that the destruction and exile are not the end of history, rather necessary steps to achieve purification of the land in order to create a new and hopeful start."[10] Thus, the beginning of Persian Yehud parallels the advent of the Davidic dynasty with a divinely elected king and the idea of a constructing a temple and creating a YHWHistic cult in Jerusalem.

---

[7] It should be noted, however, that Cyrus is no David. Although Cyrus is presented as a non-Judahite king, his "foreignness/otherness" is blurred in that he recognizes YHWH as the divine sovereign, his great power and fortune derive from YHWH, and he does what YHWH commands. Furthermore, Cyrus' status as a divinely selected temple-builder, which was one of the most important roles bestowed upon a Davidic king, recalls the greatness of the David-Solomon golden age. However, Cyrus is not an equivalent to David (i.e. a new David) but rather the Persian king is representative of Persian Yehud ideologies. Ben Zvi argues that the benevolence and divine election of Cyrus is "… clearly consistent with the idea that the principal kings of the area are not necessarily evil, nor do they necessarily oppose the will of YHWH (i.e. just as Davidic kings varied in their piety)." Moreover, "… the concluding reference to Cyrus suggests not only that the rule of foreign kings over Jerusalem is not necessarily a bad thing, but, in fact, it seems possible to raise the possibility that YHWH's kingship over Jerusalem may be executed by Cyrus. This possibility is consistent with the references to Cyrus as YHWH's anointed and as YHWH's shepherd (both royal attributes) in Isa. 44.28; 45:1." Finally, Cyrus' role also signifies that "… a bright future is one in which foreigners will recognize YHWH and the role of Israel in the divine economy. From the theological perspective of the post monarchic community, this amounts to the partial (but substantial) 'Israelization' of the world, which in turn reflects the broad sweep of the will of YHWH…" (Ehud Ben Zvi, "When the Foreign Monarch Speaks," in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Textuality*, 223, 227-28). In sum, David represents the advent of an ideal past while Cyrus represents a bright future. Chronicles also had to remain consistent with core facts, and the possibility of a renewal of the Davidic dynasty during the late Persian period would have seemed very unlikely to both authorship and readership. Additionally, the temple and cult are at the core of the discourse in Chronicles and Cyrus' role emphasizes that Jerusalem's institutions could exist independently of the Davidic kings.

[8] Liverani, "Memorandum," 186-87.

[9] Liverani, "Memorandum," 187.

In my view, the most likely reason that Chronicles used a Persian king, and not a Davidic king, is because of core facts. Chronicles could not tell its intended audience that a Davidic king restored order and initiated the rebuilding of the temple because there were no Davidic kings in Persian Yehud. Furthermore, Chronicles illustrated to its intended audience that even the great Persian king Cyrus owed his successes and power to YHWH, who divinely elected him—this means that YHWH controls all history and if people seek him, the community will be successful. Continuity of the restoration of order is contingent upon Chronicles' intended audience and the future inhabitants of Persian Yehud; that is, the intended had to learn from the past, seek YHWH, and not replicate the impious behaviour of the post-Solomonic kings. In Kalimi's words: "The restoration and rebuilding are interpreted by the Chronicler as God's will. At the same time the long-term existence of the Temple, the city and entire

---

[10] Isaac Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place and Writing* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica; Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 2005), 157.

Yehud Medina depends on the Jewish community's behaviour and quality of their relationship with God."[11]

5.3 The Cyrus Cylinder and Verse Account of Nabonidus

According to the Cyrus Cylinder, Nabonidus is a king unfit to rule Babylon, as he is guilty of wicked deeds, and cultic abominations in particular. In other words, the Cyrus Cylinder informs its intended audience that Nabonidus turns away from and neglects his duties to Marduk and Esagil, negligence which turns Marduk against him. As a result, Marduk searches for a suitable ruler to restore order in Nabonidus' chaotic Babylon. "He [Marduk] surveyed and looked throughout the lands, searching for a righteous king whom he would support. He called out his name: Cyrus, king of Anshan; he pronounced his name king over all (the world)."[12] Marduk escorts an unchallenged Cyrus into Babylon where he is accepted as a liberator who will restore order to the city (and the nation).

> He made him enter his city Babylon without fighting or battle; he saved Babylon from hardship. He delivered Nabonidus, the king who did not rever him, into his hands. All the people of Babylon, all the land of Sumer and Akkad… bowed to him and kissed his feet. They rejoiced at his kingship and their faces shone… they greeted him with gladness and praised his name.[13]

Marduk's election of Cyrus follows the restorer of order *topos* as Cyrus restores proper cultic worship to the city of Babylon: "… I daily attended to his [Marduk's] worship. My vast army moved about Babylon in peace… I sought the welfare of the city of Babylon and all its sacred centers."[14]

Similar to the Cyrus Cylinder, the Verse Account of Nabonidus states that Nabonidus abandons Babylon and its New Year festivities in favour of his newly restored cult of Sin at Harran. As a result, Nabonidus is punished while Cyrus restores order to Babylon and is greeted by the people with open arms.

---

[11] Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite Historian*, 157.
[12] Cogan, "Cyrus Cylinder," 315.
[13] Cogan, "Cyrus Cylinder," 315.
[14] Cogan, "Cyrus Cylinder," 315.

5.4 The Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon

According to the Bavarian Rock Inscription of Sennacherib, the Assyrian king's second military campaign against Babylon decimated the city. Sennacherib's second campaign illustrates the results of when a god abandons a city.

> I destroyed and tore down and burned with fire the city (and) its houses, from the foundations to its parapets. I tore out the inner and outer walls, temples, the ziggurat of brick and earth, as many as there were, and threw them into the Arahtu river. I dug canals through the city and flooded its place with water, destroying the structure of its foundation. I made its devastation greater than that of "the Flood." So that in future days, the site of that city, its temples and its gods, would not be identifiable, I completely destroyed it with water and annihilated it like inundated territory.[15]

Esarhaddon must undo his father's destruction of Babylon in order to restore order to the city. It should be noted that unlike Ahaz, Zedekiah, as well as the other post-Solomonic kings, and Nabonidus in the above examples, Sennacherib, who precedes the restorer of order in this instance, is not an incompetent king but rather is a powerful conqueror exhibiting both his military might and the supremacy of Assur.[16]

According to Porter, in order to attain Babylonian support, "... Esarhaddon began a program of actions and statements designed to present himself to the Babylonians as an acceptably Babylonian king and to demonstrate to them the benefits that could come with Assyrian rule... beginning with the rebuilding of the city of Babylon itself."[17] To present himself to the Babylonians as an acceptable Babylonian king, Esarhaddon represented himself as the restorer of order of Babylon by expressing his solicitude for the city and its patron deity, Marduk.

---

[15] Mordechai Cogan, "Sennacherib: The Capture and Destruction of Babylon (2.119E)," in *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, II, 305.
[16] Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, 24.

> Until the days were elapsed that the heart of the great lord Marduk should be appeased and he would find peace with the country against which he had raged, 70 years were to elapse, but he wrote [11] years (instead) and took pity and said: Amen! He (Marduk) had written 70 years as the quantity of its (the city's) exile (Lit: lying fallow) but merciful Marduk—soon his heart was appeased and he turned the upper into the lower (figure) so that he decreed its resettlement for 11 years.[18]

Importantly, the chaos which precedes the restorer of order is not the fault of the previous king who caused the destruction (i.e., Sennacherib) but rather is blamed on the impiety of the city; that is, an angry Marduk abandoned Babylon, a nuance which transfers the blame from Esarhaddon's father Sennacherib to the people of Babylon.[19] Marduk's abandonment of Babylon is not dissimilar to YHWH's abandonment of Jerusalem in 2 Chronicles 36.

The transfer of blame away from Sennacherib is of little surprise when one considers Assyrian ideologies. Oded summarizes the common Assyrian ideologies that are evident in Sennacherib's and Esarhaddon's inscriptions:

> It is within the authority and duty of the Assyrian king to maintain order and security, to bring peace and prosperity and restore rights wrongfully denied. Without supreme mastery of the Assyrian emperor, the station in the foreign countries is bad, and thus the Assyrian king must enforce his authority everywhere… War is sometimes just insofar as it is not dedicated to plunder but aimed at defending the entire community from chaos… The Assyrian empire is a constructive civilizing factor, saving mankind from chaos. Babylon was

---

[17] Barbara Nevling Porter, *Images, Power, and Politics: Figurative Aspects of Esarhaddon's Babylonian Policy* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 208; Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1993), 39.

[18] William W. Hallo, "Esarhaddon (2.120)," in *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, II, 306.

[19] See Mordechai Cogan, "Omens and Ideology in the Babylon Inscription of Esarhaddon," in H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld (eds.), *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Cuneiform Literatures* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1983), 79; Oded, *War, Peace and Empire*, 127.

> destroyed and flooded by Sennacherib because, as Esarhaddon claims, injustice, dishonor of parents and the like prevailed in the city. But after the punishment, peace and order must be restored.[20]

In sum, Sennacherib's and Esarhaddon's efforts were part of a collective effort to free Babylon from the reigns of chaos. In other words, Sennacherib was helping free Babylon by destroying chaos and Esarhaddon restored order after chaos was annihilated.

5.5 Analysis

Interestingly, in the examples discussed above, Hezekiah is the only indigenous king to restore order in the texts above, as the other three examples use foreign kings to restore order. The difference between Chronicles and the Cyrus Cylinder and Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon is that Chronicles is not propaganda for the foreign king. Rather, as discussed above, Cyrus acts as a restorer of order in 2 Chronicles 36 because of the limitations of core facts, and the account is meant to legitimize the centrality of Jerusalem and its temple, as well as YHWH's status of divine sovereign of the world; that is, even the most powerful king of that time attributed his successes to the god of Persian Yehud. Thus, it legitimized the central city, and institution, and god of the intended audience.

Both the Cyrus Cylinder and the Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon functioned as propaganda to represent the two kings as foreign kings who are legitimate kings of Babylon. The divine election and legitimacy of a king was very important to Near Eastern audiences. As Liverani maintains:

> [Legitimacy] means a correct chain of relationships from god to king and from king to people. In case a king lacks (or loses) legitimacy, he will be unable to

---

[20] Oded, *War, Peace and Empire*, 108.

> ensure order and prosperity for his country: it will be a disaster for the people, and to wait for "proofs" of legitimacy could make it too late. The population of any kingdom is therefore very concerned (and understandably so) with the legitimate orientation of a new king; and the critical points in any reign are the beginning and the end, his enthronement and the designation of his heir. Between these two points, the rest of the reign is almost routine—provided the gods assist.[21]

Thus, it was imperative for kings like Cyrus and Esarhaddon to present themselves as legitimate kings of Babylon, and the restorer of order *topos* was a great means for that end.

Texts employing the restorer of order narrative pattern can be very deceptive and misleading for scholars seeking historicity in these texts. Many scholars have come to false conclusions after being misled by restorer of order texts. For instance, "Cyrus propaganda" continues to mislead scholars 2 500 years after the fact.

Both the Cyrus Cylinder and the Verse Account of Nabonidus have led to traditional, or popular, views in which the Cyrus walked into Babylon unchallenged as a heroic liberator while the Nabonidus was a villainous and incompetent king who was overthrown by the Babylonian priesthood (as they supposedly let Cyrus into the city) as a result of his cultic negligence towards Marduk. However, Kuhrt has shown that this was not the case.[22]

After the Persian conquest of Babylon, Cyrus, at least in his propagandistic assertions in the Cyrus Cylinder, stressed continuity rather than discontinuity. Actually, it seems as though neither Cyrus nor Cambyses brought about a total disruption of existing conditions. Rather, as evidence from Mesopotamia suggests, existing local institutions were adapted into the new structures of the Persian empire. In fact, many known institutions in Persian period "… find their antecedents in the Mesopotamian imperial structures of the previous centuries."[23] For instance, despite the pro-Cyrus and anti-Nabonidus propaganda of the Cyrus Cylinder and Verse Account of Nabonidus, Kuhrt observes that, after the Persian conquest of Babylon, not one of Nabonidus' institutions and policies in relation to temples was discontinued or reversed, and if anything, they were strengthened and extended by the Persians.[24] Regarding the Persian continuation of Neo-Babylonian temple institutions and policies, Briant reaches conclusions similar to those of Kuhrt: "Several documents from the time of Cyrus and Cambyses indicate that the temple administrators continued to refer to regulations issued in the time of Nebuchadnezzar II, Neriglissar, and Nabonidus." In fact, in reference to private archives in particular, Briant notes that if the scribes had not dated documents by regnal years of kings, major political events, such as Cyrus' conquest, would go unnoticed.[25]

---

[21] Mario Liverani, "The Deeds of Ancient Mesopotamian Kings," in J. Sasson (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (4 vols; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000), IV, 2359.

[22] See Amelie Kuhrt, "Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood," in M. Beard and J. North (eds.), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 119-55.

The Hebrew Bible and Cyrus Cylinder have been great propaganda for both Cyrus and Persian imperial policies.

> One gets the impression from reading the Jewish texts that the favors and privileges granted by Cyrus were exceptional compared with normal relations between a Near Eastern sovereign and an ethnoreligious community. Along with the Babylonized Cyrus of the *Cylinder*, this portrayal has played no small part in creating an image of the Achaemenid conqueror as a pacific and tolerant king, making the "final break" with the "barbarous and cruel" practices of the Assyro-Babylonians. Even today, Cyrus is presented by his modern acolytes as the inventor of "human rights". Some have gone so far as to consider the demeanor

---

[23] Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (Trans. P.T. Daniels; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 70.

[24] Kuhrt, "Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood," 148.

[25] Briant, *Cyrus to Alexander*, 71.

> of Cyrus to be a devotee of a religion, Zoroastrianism, that by its rejection of idols actually resembles the religion of the Judeo-Israelites, and that these Achaemenid-Jewish connections were part of a much broader reform of the "polytheistic chaos".[26]

As stated by Briant, such associations with and attributes of Cyrus have forged for him and his successors a very idealistic image. Furthermore, Cyrus was neither a liberator nor a pacifist; rather he was a conqueror, and like other conquerors, he was ruthless. Contrary to popular belief, Cyrus neither walked into Babylon unopposed, nor did he liberate it.[27] Contrary to the notion that Cyrus was attributed to be the founder of human rights, he, like other conquerors, massacred opposition populations, if he deemed it necessary. For instance, Grayson translates The Nabonidus Chronicle as: "Cyrus (II) did battle at Opis on the [bank of] the Tigris against the army of Akkad, the people of Akkad retreated. He carried off the plunder (and) slaughtered the people. On the fourteenth day Sippar was captured without battle" (*ABC* 7, iii. 12-14). Kuhrt, on the other hand, translates this account as: "burnt the people of Akkad with fire, he killed the people." Neither Grayson's nor Kuhrt's translation portrays a benevolent liberator.[28]

---

[26] Briant, *Cyrus to Alexander*, 47.

[27] Kuhrt concludes: "One important element in building a picture of Cyrus as able to exploit and manipulate opposition to Nabonidus should thus be questioned, and perhaps entirely discarded… Cyrus did not walk unopposed into Babylon, nor did he liberate it. Rather, when he eventually entered Babylonia, possibly after years of border skirmishes, he had to fight a battle, ending in severe reprisals against the population; in response to this brutal example, Sippar and Babylon surrendered and, after investing the capital with Iranian troops, a carefully orchestrated, ceremonial welcome by the capital city to Cyrus was engineered by his general' ("Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood," 134).

[28] Kuhrt, "Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood," 133-34. Kuhrt contends that the extreme measures used by Cyrus at Opis paid off since Sippar, the next city in line of attack, surrendered to him. After this, Nabonidus fled to Babylon where he was captured by Cyrus' general who made sure that the conqueror would be welcomed as a new king (this was a practice used by the Assyrians in newly conquered areas).

In regards to the differences between Persians and the "barbarous" Neo-Assyrians and Neo-Babylonians, the Persians governed a vast area with systems comparable to those of the Neo-Assyrians[29] and, as mentioned above, continued many Neo-Babylonian institutions. In addition, the Cyrus Cylinder is based on Aššurbanipal's building texts in Babylon, and modelled Cyrus after the great Neo-Assyrian king.[30] Also, in a manner similar to the Neo-Assyrians and Neo-Babylonians, the Persians practiced population deportations. Kuhrt concludes:

> The assumption that Persian imperial control was somehow more tolerable than the Assyrian yoke is based, on the one hand, on the limited experience of one influential group of a very small community which happened to benefit by Persian policy, and on the other, on a piece of blatant propaganda modelled on similar texts devised to extol a representative and practitioner of the earlier and much condemned Assyrian imperialism.[31]

In sum, pro-Persian propaganda such as the Cyrus Cylinder has contributed to the Persians' reputation of benevolence, a reputation which has distinguished them from other ancient Near Eastern sovereigns.

What can one learn about events during the reigns of Hezekiah and Ahaz, Cyrus and Zedekiah, Cyrus and Nabonidus, or Esarhaddon from the accounts discussed above? In my view, not much, but I believe that it is important to recognize both the narrative pattern and how the events are emplotted. In restorer of order texts, I believe that a king's actions must conform to the role he is given, whether that is a disruptor or restorer of order. In Weitzman words: "Whether an act restores or disrupts tradition depends on how it is retroactively emplotted."[32] Kings like Ahaz in Chronicles, Nabonidus in the Cyrus Cylinder, or Antiochus IV in 2 Maccabees are bound to look like bad kings because they are disruptors of order whereas their restorer of order counterparts received good PR and political benefits from being framed in this tradition. "The sacrilegious king who robs temples and interferes in tradition—was a stereotypical role imposed literarily on kings by those who would supplant them."[33]

---

[29] Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East*, II, 531-33; *idem*, "Cyrus Cylinder," 93; M.A. Dandamayev, "Achaemenid Imperial Policies and Provincial Governments," *Iranica Antiqua* 34 (1999), 270.
[30] Kuhrt, "Cyrus Cylinder," 88, 92.
[31] Kuhrt, "Cyrus Cylinder," 94-95.
[32] Steven Weitzman, "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution," *JBL* 123.2 (2004), 226.

---

[33] Weitzman, "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution," 234.

6. Explaining Disaster: Immediate and Deferred Retribution in Chronicles, the *Histories*, and the *Hellenica*

The central event in Chronicles, the *Histories,* and the *Hellenica* may be interpreted as a disaster precipitated by continuous violations of the social centre of each discourse, and it because of these violations that divine retribution falls on the guilty parties and brings about their destruction.

In Chronicles, the *Histories,* and the *Hellenica,* both immediate and deferred retribution are at work in the text, and therefore, disaster is caused both by the characters during whose time the disaster occurs and by their predecessors. In sum, divine actors safeguard and maintain the social centre in each of the three narratives by collectively punishing those who experience the destruction for both their own transgressions and those of their predecessors. This chapter examines how this *topos* functions in Chronicles' explanation for the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, the *Histories'* explanation for the defeat of the Persians, and the *Hellenica's* explanation for the end of Spartan hegemony.

6.1 The Case for Immediate Retribution in Chronicles

Generally, retribution in Chronicles has been understood to be individual and immediate. For instance, Wellhausen suggested that a "divine pragmatism" is operative in Chronicles in which sin never misses its punishment and where misfortune never occurs where guilt is wanting.[1] Following Welhausen's model of retribution in Chronicles, Von Rad states that there is "… no disaster without guilt, no sin without punishment."[2] Von Rad adds that "...the Chronicler is at pains to show Jahweh's judgment or salvation still affected each generation individually."[3] Similarly, Dillard presents a model of immediate retribution in Chronicles. He contends that "[t]he Chronicler's adherence to a 'theology of immediate divine retribution' provides his dominant compositional technique... 'Retribution theology' refers to the author's apparent conviction that reward and punishment are not deferred, but rather follow immediately on the heels of the precipitating events."[4]

---

[1] Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), 203.

Japhet provides the most extensive and detailed discussion on individual and immediate retribution in Chronicles. Like those of Wellhausen, Von Rad, and Dillard, Japhet's model of divine justice in Chronicles excludes ancestral merit or cumulative sin; that is, each generation begins anew and is not held accountable for the impious deeds of a preceding generation. In other words, retribution is swift, as it immediately follows the transgression and is directed at those who are responsible. Japhet contends that this maxim is related to Ezekiel 18:20: "A son will not suffer for the misdeed of the father, nor will a father suffer for the misdeed of the son; the most righteousness will be upon himself, and the most wicked person will be upon himself." In other words, the righteous are responsible for their acts and the wicked for their own; each person is responsible for his or her own actions and will not suffer or prosper on the account of others. Thus, according to Japhet, "Chronicles negates the idea of *collective* retribution."[5]

---

[2] Gerhard Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions* (2 vols; New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962), I, 348.
[3] Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 349.
[4] Raymond Dillard, *2 Chronicles* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1987), 76.

Japhet also contends that Chronicles provided an appropriate punishment for any transgression, always rewarded piety, made every difficulty, affliction, and /or defeat an act of retribution, created a direct connection between crime and punishment,[6] and made every success, public or private, a reward.[7]

6.2 *Arguments against Universal Individual and Immediate Retribution*

Chronicles' model of divine retribution is not absolute. Rather, retribution in Chronicles is, at times, nuanced, fluid, and ambiguous; that is, there are instances in which pious individuals are punished and others are rewarded without exhibiting piety, as well as other examples in which retribution is not immediate and people are punished for the impious acts of others.

Ben Zvi, presenting several important counterexamples, argues that Japhet has overstated her case.[8] For instance, he points out that the most obvious counterexample is Israel's punishment for David's disastrous census (1 Chron. 21:7, 14). Importantly, Ben Zvi illustrates that although Chronicles extensively reinterpreted the census narrative in 2 Samuel 24, it does not deviate from the Samuel account that 70,000 perished because of David's sin. In fact, Ben Zvi concludes that a comparative analysis of the text of the two relevant verses, 1 Chron. 21:14 and 2 Sam. 24:15, illustrates that the reference to the 70,000 Israelites is virtually the only element from the Samuel account that is copied verbatim in Chronicles. Thus, Chronicles leaves out much of the information provided in 2 Sam. 24:15 and copies verbatim the 70,000 Israelites.[9] Japhet argues that 2 Chron. 21:7 is "one exceptional case" of ancestral merit;[10] however, this is not the case, as several other counterexamples to Japhet's model are evident.

---

[5] Japhet, *Ideology*, 156-63.
[6] See Kalimi, "Literary-Chronological Proximity," 318-38.
[7] Japhet, *Ideology*, 166-68.
[8] Ben Zvi, "Gateway," 221-24; *idem*, "A Sense of Proportion," 37-51; *idem*, "The Book of Chronicles," 5-26.

For instance, Solomon inherited the blessing to build the temple before he was born (1 Chron. 17:11), which is almost certainly a blessing that is not and cannot be explained by individual merit. Furthermore, before Solomon is born, God knows that he will be "a man of rest", and subsequently Israel will be bestowed with "peace and quiet," which is also a reward associated with individual merit throughout Chronicles. [11]

Additionally, Chronicles contains four instances in which a pious king faces a military campaign from a powerful enemy: Asa (2 Chron. 14:8-14; 16:1-7), Jehoshaphat (20:1-30), and Hezekiah (32:1-21). Importantly, throughout Chronicles, such military attacks most often are acts of divine retribution to punish impious kings (2 Chron. 12:2-5; 21:16-17; 24:23-25; 28:5-8, 17-20; 33:11; 36:5-6, 12-20). Japhet explains these as instances of divine tests.[12] She argues that the outcome of these wars "… conforms to the principle of reward and punishment: victory is achieved with God's help and therefore constitutes a reward; defeat represents punishment."[13] In cases in which YHWH defeats the enemies of Judah (2 Chron. 14:8-14; 20:1-30; 32:1-21), the king seeks YHWH, and not a foreign ally; on the other hand, when Asa seeks a foreign ally instead of YHWH, he is punished. In 2 Chron. 16:1-7, Asa seeks the aid of Ben-hadad of Aram and is punished for his decision. Asa then is abandoned by both YHWH and the army of Aram; he is also punished by numerous other wars (16:7-9). The contrast in the results of the invasions against Asa clearly illustrates the principle of rewards for seeking YHWH and punishments for not seeking YHWH. Hanani the seer informs Asa: "Because of your dependence (i.e., you depended) on the king of Syria, and you did not depend on the YHWH your god, thus the army of the king of Syria has fled to safety from your hand. Were the Cushites and the Luvites not an army made great by exceedingly numerous chariots and horsemen? But because you depended on YHWH, he gave them into your hand" (16:7-8).

---

[9] Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion," 40.
[10] Japhet, 162 (*n.* 477).
[11] Ben Zvi "A Sense of Proportion," 41.
[12] Japhet, *Ideology*, 191-98.
[13] Japhet, *Ideology*, 191.

Ben Zvi accepts Japhet's explanation that these are divine tests,[14] but states that this still is problematic for Japhet's model of individual retribution. Regardless of the results of these wars, such attacks generally were considered to be a relatively typical divine response to wrongdoing, in other words, a punishment.[15]

> But this explanation (which I accept) does not deny, but rather emphasizes that these accounts describe divinely caused effects (i.e., these attacks) that cannot be explained as a result of human actions within the framework of a coherent system of individually assessed correspondence between human actions and divinely regulated results.[16]

---

[14] See Ehud Ben Zvi, "When YHWH Tests People: General Considerations and Particular Observations Regarding the Books of Chronicles and Job," Paper presented at SBL Pacific Northwest Regional Congress. Spring 2005. Vancouver, British Columbia, 1-13. Kelly echoes Japhet's argument when he states, "Japhet is surely correct to understand these cases not as retribution but as opportunities for testing the genuineness of the leaders' faith" ("'Retribution' Revisited," 223).

[15] Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion," 39.

[16] Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion," 39.

Thus, divine tests of pious kings conflict with an individually assessed model of reward and punishment. Rather than a component of an apparently mechanical model of individual reward and punishment, perhaps divine testing of pious kings may be best understood through an inter-textual approach which considers other pious individuals, namely Abraham and Job, who are also divinely tested.[17] Another possible explanation is that Chronicles could not get around the core facts accepted by the community and emplotted these events in a manner that conformed to its theological apparatus; this appears to be the case with the narrative of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah and challenge of YHWH, as well as Baasha's confrontation with Asa.

Additionally, Ben Zvi points out that not all pious people enjoy blessings, such as longevity, children, and prosperity. For instance, Zechariah, the son of Yehoiada, is killed (2 Chron. 24:21) and Hanani the seer is imprisoned (16:10).[18] In both cases, prophets are punished for the pious act of delivering the word of God. Ben Zvi suggests that such cases of "prophetic martyrology" stand in contrast to individually assessed correspondence between actions and rewards. Although the kings who perpetrated these crimes are punished, nevertheless the prophets suffer, as well. Thus, suffering then cannot be equated exclusively with impiety and wrongdoing.

---

[17] Ben Zvi states that pious or seemingly pious individuals make good candidates for divine testing. "As a result, the set of candidates for assessment were likely to consist of characters constructed within the discourse of the community as loyal and effective regents of YHWH on earth, those who either led or seemed to have led society to a greater level of fulfillment of YHWH's laws and the associated blessings, or who by their influential, exemplary role served both as ideological role models, and as attestations of the goodness that comes from accepting YHWH's yoke fully." Examples of divinely tested pious individuals include Abraham, Job, David, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah. The latter five are Chronistic kings who were tested after receiving blessings ("When YHWH Tests," 3-4).

[18] Ben Zvi, "The Book of Chronicles," 8.

6.3 Deferred Retribution in Chronicles

Chronicles also provides instances of deferred retribution, or cumulative sin, which are extremely problematic for mechanical models of immediate and individual retribution. For instance, Hezekiah's address, which is without a parallel in Kings, states:

> For our fathers have been untrue and have done what is evil in the eyes of YHWH our god, and they have left him. They have turned away their faces from the abode of YHWH, and they have turned their backs. They also shut the doors of the porch and extinguished the lights, and they have not burned incense. They have not offered burnt offerings in the sanctuary to the god of Israel. The anger of YHWH was on Judah and Jerusalem. And he put terror, wicked reputation, and hissing on them, as that which you are seeing with your eyes. Behold, our fathers have fallen by the sword; and our sons and our daughters and our wives are in captivity on account of this. (2 Chron. 29:6-9)

Hezekiah's speech obviously contains cumulative sin for which others are punished. If Chronicles' model of individual and immediate retribution is absolute, then why would this passage be included? Similarly, Chronicles includes Huldah's prophecy (2 Chron. 34:23-28), which creates problems for Japhet's assertion that sin of "[o]nly Zedekiah and his generation" is responsible for the destruction of the temple. Moreover, a generation, or rather nearly two generations, suffers for the sins of Zedekiah's generation and is exiled for seventy years (36:20-21).

6.4 Summary

Although individual and immediate retribution are key components in Chronicles' retributive model, it is evident that Chronicles presents a more complex and fluid model than Japhet's conclusions suggest. In other words, Chronicles conveyed to its intended audience a message that God governs the world by different principles. YHWH governs not an absolute world, but a less predictable, ambiguous world which allows for a variety of potential interpretations about historical events.[19] Scholars such as Wellhausen, Von Rad, Dillard, and Japhet seem to have mistaken the map for the territory. Countless examples of individual and immediate retribution abound from the narrative; however, in addition to the several individual counterexamples discussed above, it is my contention that Chronicles reveals a system in which cumulative sin, or ancestral merit, is the main reason for the a central event in the primary narrative, the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. I agree with Ben Zvi's conclusion:

> Thus, the entire book of Chronicles, as opposed to many of its separate accounts, suggests to its historical audience an understanding of the divine ways of governing the world that is much more complex and less predictable than a divinely administered principle of immediate individual reward or punishment.[20]

6.5 Immediate Retribution vs. Deferred Retribution in Greek Historiography

In the Greek world, divine punishment can fall immediately upon the impious one, but it may also be deferred for many years, even for generations.[21] Regarding Xenophon's *Hellenica,* Pownall states: "He [Xenophon] makes it clear throughout that individuals who commit moral wrongdoings do not meet with success, for almost every moral offense that he mentions in his narrative is almost immediately followed by the destruction of the guilty."[22] She notes that with the exception of one instance (7.4.34), deferred punishment does not exist in the *Hellenica*. Rather, Xenophon employed immediate retribution, in which people are responsible for their own actions. In other words, those who transgress are the ones who are punished. Pownall contends that the deferred punishment does not conform to Xenophon's moral system since it absolves the individual of personal responsibility.[23]

---

[19] Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion," 50.

[20] Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion," 44.

[21] K.J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality: In the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1994), 260.

[22] Frances Pownall, *Lessons From the Past*, 86.

> The large number of negative exempla in the *Hellenica* indicates the author's belief that individuals themselves ought to pay for the penalty for their own crimes, while the juxtaposition of crime and punishment serves as a more direct (and therefore effective) deterrent than a vague threat of future harm befalling one's descendants. Xenophon's innovation of paradigmatic history thus brought with it the removal of the concept of inherited guilt from the historiographical realm.[24]

According to Pownall, Xenophon left a "powerful legacy" for later historians; that is, later fourth century and Hellenistic historiographies, for the most part, replaced the *topos* of deferred punishment with that of immediate retribution.[25] However, as with Chronicles, although Xenophon most often used individual and immediate retribution in cases of divine retribution, cumulative impiety and deferred punishment seem to be active in the *Hellenica*; that is, Xenophon used both immediate and deferred retribution to explain a central event in his narrative, the military defeat of Sparta at Leuctra.

The Histories uses both immediate retribution and deferred punishment. The Hermotimus-Panionius story (8.105-106) and Pheretime's punishment (4.205) are just two of many instances in which Herodotus uses immediate retribution. In addition to Herodotus' use of immediate retribution, he also employs deferred punishment.

> Talthybius' vengeance was wrought upon the sons of the heralds who had volunteered to die in expiation of the hero's wrath (7.137): the delay, and the fact that punishment fell on the sons of the very same men, indeed make that punishment especially divine. Croesus famously paid the price for his ancestor Gyges (1.91.1). There is no statue of limitations for divine retribution: something unfortunate is bound to happen sooner or later.[26]

---

[23] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 273-74.
[24] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 274.
[25] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 274.
[26] Harrison, *Divinity and History*, 112-13. Cf. Huldah's prophecy (2 Chron. 34:23-28).

Although Croesus is punished for Gyges' impiety, he is also punished for his own *hybris* (1.33). Croesus' dual punishment, which consists of both immediate and deferred retribution,[27] is significant because he is a prototype for Xerxes; that is, as discussed already in Chapter 3, Herodotus' account of Xerxes and his demise, as well as that of the Persians, follows a paradigm similar to that of Croesus. The Solon-Croesus scene initiates a paradigm which continues through *Histories* until it ends in Cyrus' closing statement (9.122). Thus, the defeat of Xerxes and his army, a central narrative in the *Histories*, may be understood as a combination of immediate and deferred retribution. As is the case with both Chronicles and the *Hellenica*, I argue that the *Histories* used both immediate and deferred retribution to explain the demise of Xerxes and the Persians. In other words, comparable with the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and the fall of Sparta, the defeat of Xerxes and the Persian army is the direct result of both immediate and deferred retribution.

6.6 The Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, the Greek Military Victory over the Persians, and the Fall of Sparta: Retribution in Central Events in Chronicles, the *Histories*, and the *Hellenica*

6.6.1 Chronicles' Explanations for the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple

Both Kings and Chronicles informed their respective communities that the fall of Jerusalem was a direct result of Israel's transgressions. In other words, YHWH brought Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem as an act of divine retribution to punish a sinful nation. Although both Kings and Chronicles served a similar theological purpose, using history to instruct theologically their respective communities and a religious system to provide a foundation for their respective historiographies, one unique aspect of their individual perspectives is that each text suggested a different cause of, or source for, the destruction of the Jerusalem temple.

---

[27] Cf. Zedekiah. See discussion above.

It has been suggested widely that Chronicles reworked 2 Kings in order to correspond with its theological apparatus of immediate retribution. In Japhet's words, "[n]either Manasseh's sinfulness nor the people's cumulative transgression brought about the Temple's destruction. Only Zedekiah and his generation are responsible for the disaster that occurred in his time."[28] Furthermore, McKenzie echoes Japhet: "In accord with his theology of individual responsibility and immediate retribution, Chronicles blames the exile on Zedekiah and his generation rather than on Manasseh as in Kings."[29] Similarly, Myers states that the: "[c]hief blame for the debacle falls upon the king because he consistently refused to follow the directions of the prophets, notably Jeremiah… Thus Jerusalem was destroyed, the temple leveled, and the people taken into exile because the wrath of Yahweh was kindled by the refusal of the king and officials to listen to his word."[30]

I do agree that the conduct of Zedekiah and his generation contributed to the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple. During his brief reign, Zedekiah committed cultic abominations (2 Chron. 36:14) and failed to seek YHWH.[31] In fact, he mocked and scoffed at the prophets and messengers of God "until there was no remedy" (36:16). Such impious acts would never go unpunished in Chronicles, so it is little surprise that retribution fell on Zedekiah. However, scholars such as Japhet, McKenzie, and Myers overemphasize the doctrine of individual and immediate retribution. As illustrated above, since one may provide several significant counterexamples, Chronicles' theological model of individual and immediate retribution is not as absolute as Japhet, McKenzie, and Myers suggest. Rather, it is my contention that cumulative sin plays a far more significant role in the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple than is thought by some.

---

[28] Japhet, *Ideology*, 163. For Japhet's discussion on the destruction of the temple, see *Ideology*, 157-63.

[29] McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 369.

[30] Jacob M. Myers, *II Chronicles* (AB 13; New York: Doubleday, 1965), 222-23.

[31] Zedekiah's main sins were ignoring the words of the prophet Jeremiah (see Jeremiah 37-38) and stiffening his neck (see Jer. 7:26; 17:23), ignoring his final opportunity to seek YHWH and repent, and mocking and scoffing at YHWH's prophets and messengers (2 Chron. 36:12, 15-16).

First, in my opinion, Huldah's prophecy immediately calls into question Japhet's conclusion that "only Zedekiah's" generation is responsible.

> And she said to them, "Thus says YHWH, the god of Israel: "Say to the man who sent you to me, 'Thus says YHWH," 'Behold, I am bringing misfortune upon this place and upon its inhabitants, all the curses written in the book, which has been read before the king of Judah. As they have left me and have burned incense to other gods in order to provoke anger in me with all the works of their hands. My wrath will gush forth upon this place and it will not go out. But to the king of Judah, who sent you to supplicate to YHWH, thus you will say to him, "Thus says YHWH, the god of Israel": 'Regarding the words that you have heard, because your heart was tender and you humbled yourself before God when you heard his words against this place and its inhabitants, and you have humbled yourself before me, and have ripped your garments and wept before me, I have listened to you,' says YHWH. *Behold, I am gathering you to your fathers, and you will be gathered to your grave in peace, and your eyes will not see all the misfortune, which I am bringing upon this place and its inhabitants.*'" And they returned word to the king. (2 Chron 34: 23-28)

It is evident from Huldah's prophecy that the destruction of Jerusalem is imminent and Josiah's piety has merely prolonged the inevitable. Importantly, Ben Zvi points out that "… Huldah neither calls for repentance nor suggests that Josiah and the people should correct their ways. She does not refer to his previous reforms as merit for lightening the extreme punishment. In fact, she does not refer to his previous reforms or to his plans for restoring the temple at all…."[32] Moreover, nowhere in the text does it state that the announced destruction could be averted by pious deeds. The narrative moves quickly from Huldah's prophecy to the actual destruction, as only nineteen verses separate the crowning of Josiah's successor, Jehoahaz, and the burning of the temple (2 Chron. 36:1-19)—this is a greater number of verses than the number provided for the account of the finding the book and Huldah's prophecy (2 Chron. 34:14-29), and the same number of verses given to the account of Josiah's pesah (2 Chron.35:1-19).[33] The cause of the imminent destruction of Jerusalem is cumulative sin; that is, sin has been accumulating since the days of Rehoboam, and for such reasons, YHWH is going to "bring evil" upon Jerusalem and its inhabitants. Kelly correctly points out that "all have sinned" (2 Chron. 6.36)[34] and have contributed to the final demise of the kingdom.[35]

Similarly, when Hezekiah repents his pride, YHWH delays the imminent destruction of Jerusalem: "But Hezekiah humbled himself for his heart was proud, he and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the anger of YHWH did not come against them in the days of Hezekiah" (32:26). Regarding Hezekiah's repentance, Johnstone states: "Hezekiah's is a model response: he humbles himself… the necessary first step in rehabilitation. At least in his day the penalty is stayed-but with the implication that the inbuilt self-destruction of the people is only delayed, not permanently averted."[36] I agree with Johnstone's observation: pious kings such as Hezekiah and Josiah do not witness YHWH's wrath, but the destruction is merely delayed, not averted. Thus, since the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple were imminent, Zedekiah's generation hardly can be regarded as the lone scapegoat for the disaster.

---

[32] Ehud Ben Zvi, "Observations on Josiah's Account in Chronicles and Implications for Reconstructing the Worldview of the Chronicler," *Forthcoming*, 97.
[33] Ben Zvi, "Observations on Josiah's Account," 98.
[34] "If they sin against you, for there is no human who does not sin, and you are angry with them, and you place them before an enemy, and they are deported to a distant or nearby land " (2 Chron. 6:36).
[35] Kelly, "'Retribution Revisited," 218.

Finally, not even the post-destruction punishment conforms to a mechanical model of individual and immediate retribution, as nearly two generations suffer for the sins of Zedekiah's generation when the people are exiled for seventy years (36:20-21). Although the seventy years are a sabbath for the land during which it can be purified (Lev. 26:33-35) and fulfill prophecy (Jer. 25:12; 29:10), it still goes contrary to a rigid theological model of individual and immediate retribution. Ben Zvi concludes that "[n]ot only was more than one generation affected by this fulfillment, but most of those who were affected were *not even born* at the time in which the divine word came to Jeremiah. Significantly, *there is no attempt in Chronicles to correlate between being in exile and individual wrongdoing*."[37] Thus, a model of individual and immediate retribution fails to explain the punishment of people who had yet to be born and the lack of association between being in exile and individual wrongdoing.

Some scholars have used Chronicles' account of Manasseh's repentance (33:12-13) as further evidence that only Zedekiah's generation is responsible for the destruction of the temple.[38] In 2 Kgs 21:11-14, a prophecy warns that as a result of Manasseh's abominations, Jerusalem will be destroyed when it is delivered into the hands of its enemies. Manasseh had rebuilt the high places, erected altars for Baal, made an Asherah, made his son pass through fire, and practiced illicit cultic activities (witchcraft and divination) (21:3-7). Manasseh's sins are compounded by the sins of those before him, for, in addition to Manasseh's sins, Israel had provoked YHWH to anger "... since the day their ancestors came from Egypt, even to this day" (21:15). The cumulative sin is reaffirmed in 2 Kgs 24:3-4, in which the Chaldeans (as well as Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites) come against Jerusalem "... because of the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he had done, and also for the innocent blood he had shed, for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood; and YHWH would not forgive."

---

[36] William Johnstone, *1 and 2 Chronicles: 2 Chronicles 10-36, Guilt and Atonement* (2 vols; JSOTSup 254; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), II, 220.
[37] Ben Zvi, "A Sense of Proportion," 42-43. My emphasis.
[38] See Japhet, *Ideology*, 163; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 355.

Interestingly, Manasseh, who was Judah's longest serving king, reigned for the fifty-five years between Judah's two most pious post-Solomonic kings, Hezekiah and Josiah; in contrast to these two virtuous kings, Manasseh's transgressions are heightened. Manasseh commits acts of abomination in 2 Chron. 33:3-7 similar to those he does in 2 Kgs. 21:3-7.[39] However, according to

---

[39] Chronicles seems to suggest that Manasseh is guilty of the abominations of the Canaanites, as its depiction of Manasseh's deeds resounds strongly with the message of Deut. 18:9-13. Since the "abominations of the nations" involve seeking forces outside of YHWH, and seeking YHWH is a central component to Chronicles' theological apparatus, such abominations likely had major implications for Chronicles' theological message. In Chronicles, seeking someone, or forces, outside of YHWH had grave consequences, as is the case for Saul (1 Chron. 10:13). Furthermore, the Canaanites were dispossessed of the land for practicing such abominations in the eyes of YHWH (Deut. 18:14; 2 Chron. 33:2); thus, it may be assumed that without Manasseh's repentance, that is, his seeking YHWH, he (and his generation) may have been dispossessed as well. This adds further significance to Manasseh's repentance. Moreover, Chronicles' account of Manasseh's abominations slightly diverges from that of 2 Kings. For instance, in v. 6, Chronicles adds "sorcery" to the 2 Kgs. 21:6 list, an addition which, once again, closely associates the list with Deuteuronomy 18 (Deut. 18:10). Also, in addition to excluding Ahab from v. 3 and adding the Valley of Ben-hinnom to v.6, Chronicles pluralizes words from 2 Kings: "Baals/Baalim" (v. 3), "Asheroth" (v. 3), and "sons" (v. 6). The pluralized "sons" and the addition of "the Valley of Ben-Hinnom" may associate Manasseh's sins with those of Ahaz (2 Chron. 28:1-7), who, in

McKenzie, Chronicles still managed to rework the Kings' account enough in order to preserve his underlining theological principles.

> As is typical of the Chronicler's style, verse 10 begins the same way as its counterpart in 2 Kgs 21:20, but then the Chronicler makes changes in accord with his message and theology. Rather than the prophetic announcement of Judah's impending fate in 2 Kgs 21:10-15, 2 Chr 33:10 simply states that YHWH spoke to Manasseh and the people, who in turn refused to listen. Again, the Chronicler's theology of individual responsibility does not allow the exile to be blamed on Manasseh.[40]

In a manner typical of Chronicles, the people act impiously because of an impious king, so YHWH warns Manasseh and the people, who fail to heed the exhortation (i.e., they did not seek YHWH), and as a result Manasseh is captured by the commanders of the army of the Assyrian king, who take him to Babylon in restraints (2 Chron. 33:10-11). However, in vv. 12-13, while in captivity, Manasseh humbles himself before YHWH, repents, and seeks YHWH ("Then Manasseh knew that YHWH was God").[41] As a result, Manasseh is rewarded with a time of peace and prosperity; he is rewarded with building projects (v.14); he then removes foreign gods from the House of YHWH and high places which he himself had built from the mountain of the House of YHWH (v. 15); he sets up an altar to YHWH (v.16), and orders Judah to serve YHWH (v.16).[42]

Chronicles, is the worst king of Judah. For a discussion on Chronicles' pluralized "sons" in 2 Chron. 28:3, see Ben Zvi "A Gateway," 221 (*n.* 11).

[40] McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 355.

[41] For an interesting discussion on Manasseh's sin and repentance in comparison with David's sin and repentance in 1 Chronicles 21, see N. Bailey, "God and David in 1 Chronicles 21: Edged with Mist," in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Scripture*, 337-59, esp. 349-56.

[42] It should be noted that although Manasseh is responsible for cultic reforms synonymous with seeking YHWH, v. 17 states explicitly that his community still sacrificed in the high places. McKenzie summarizes Manasseh's cultic reforms as follows: "Verses 15-17 detail the correction of many of Manasseh's apostasies described earlier in the chapter. In Kings it is left to Josiah to correct Manasseh's evils, and even then, as the book now stands, it is too little too late to prevent the exile. Josiah's significance in Chronicles is not as great as in Kings, and Manasseh is not blamed for the exile, so that he reverses many of his own sins. The damage, however, is done, as indicated by the 'high places' that are left for Josiah to remove (v. 17)" (*1-2 Chronicles*, 356). Also worth noting is the fact that Manasseh is the only king whose reign begins impiously and

The Manasseh narrative in Chronicles is interesting because the worst sinner of all, according to Kings, becomes a pious and rewarded king by the end of his reign in Chronicles. Although I do not deny that individual and immediate retribution is part of the reason why Chronicles changed the Manasseh narrative, I maintain that Chronicles changed from its source to justify the length of Manasseh's reign. As previously discussed in Chapter 1, the length of a king's reign is a core fact, and therefore, Manasseh's fifty-five year reign is a core fact just as the temple being destroyed during Zedekiah's reign is a core fact. Chronicles could not change the core facts of the narrative, namely the length of Manasseh's reign, but could make Manasseh repent in order to justify his long reign.[43] It is important to emphasize, however, that the Manasseh narrative in Chronicles does not place the entire burden of the destruction of the temple on Zedekiah.

In light of the considerations above, Chronicles' narrative about Zedekiah and the destruction of the temple contains both individual and cumulative sin. The Chaldean military campaign is the result of cumulative sin, which includes that of the most recent transgressors, Zedekiah and his generation. Thus, Zedekiah and all of Judah, which includes *all* post-Solomonic kings, are responsible for the temple's destruction. 2 Chron. 32:26 and 2 Chron 34:23-28 inform the reader that a destructive campaign against Jerusalem is imminent, but has been delayed as the

---

ends piously; that is, Rehoboam (2 Chronicles 10-12), Asa (2 Chronicles 14-16), Joash (2 Chronicles 23-24), Amaziah (2 Chronicles 25), and Uzziah (2 Chronicles 26) are responsible for polemic reigns in which piety precedes impiety, opposite to Manasseh's reign in which impiety precedes piety. Japhet concludes: "Thus, although in principle Manasseh's reign is portrayed along familiar Chronistic principles, his reign nevertheless has a stamp of its own, illustrated also by several details" (*I & II Chronicles,* 1001).

[43] See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena,* 206-7; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles,* 1002.

result of pious kings. This being said, Huldah's prophecy "... removes neither agency nor responsibility from Zedekiah and his generation."[44] Zedekiah's sin can be attributed to the fact that he had to be an impious king because of the core fact that the temple was destroyed during his reign. However, this does not mean that only his generation is responsible.

6.6.2 The Defeat of Persia

Xerxes' *hybris* is first evident when he states, "... we will make Persian territory end only at the sky, the domain of Zeus, so that sun will not shine beyond our borders" (7.8). According to Cairns, "Xerxes is... a typical *hybristês* in believing that his good fortune and that of his nation can only continue—god is guiding destiny for the best, and the Persians themselves have merely to follow."[45] Xerxes' *hybris* is the direct result of a continuation of the Persian *nomos* of expansionism, which of course violates the *Histories*' central law of moderation. The Persian king must add to the empire, just as Cyrus, Cambyses, and Darius had before him.[46] This point suggests that Xerxes' *hybris* and impious acts are a continuation of the activities of his predecessors, and therefore, the divine retribution that comes against his reign is the result of both his and his predecessors' conduct. In the *Histories*, impiety is punishable by either immediate retribution or deferred punishment. Xerxes' punishment is a result of both.

---

[44] Ben Zvi, "Observations on Josiah's Account,"104.

[45] Douglas L. Cairns, "*Hybris*, Dishonour, and Thinking Big," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116 (1996), 13.

[46] J.A.S. Evans, "The Imperialist Impulse," *Herodotus the Explorer: Three Essays*, 12.

It is noteworthy that prior to his campaign against Greece, the "tragic warner"[47] Artabanus warns and exhorts Xerxes that acts of *hybris* anger the gods and result in divine retribution.

> You can see how the god blasts living things that are prominent and prevents their display of superiority, while small creatures don't irritate him at all; you can see that it is always the largest buildings and trees on which he hurls his thunderbolts. It is god's way to curtail anything excessive…This happens because the god does not allow anyone but himself to feel pride. (7.10)[48]

At first, Xerxes heeds the advice of Artabanus, only to be deluded by night visions (7.12, 14, 19) induced by the gods. Importantly, Pelling points out: "It is telling that Artabanus himself *tries* to explain it [the night visions] all away rationalistically, but he cannot succeed, and he himself is cowed into accepting it. It is inevitable, and for divine reasons, that Xerxes must invade, and suffer what he must suffer."[49]

It seems as though Xerxes was unable to escape his fate; that is, as a successor to the Persian throne, he was destined to be punished by the gods for the excess and *hybris* of his predecessors, a scenario which he then compounded with his own impious behaviour. In other words, Xerxes was governed by a choice made by Cyrus before he was born—the Persians would follow the *nomos* of imperialism. A decision that allowed the Persians to live by their own will and to be their own masters under Cyrus (as well as under the subsequent reigns of Cambyses and Darius) greatly limited Xerxes' options four generations later, for he and the Persians were now at the will of the gods. Thus, Xerxes had to invade Greece.[50]

---

[47] See Richmond Lattimore, "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus," *Classical Philology* 34 (1939), 24-35.

[48] This speech from a wise advisor is comparable to that of Solon to Croesus in 1.32 ("… because the god often offers prosperity to men, but then destroys them utterly and completely.") and that of Amasis to Polycrates in 3.40 ("I worry about your remarkable good fortune, because I know that the gods are jealous of success.").

[49] C.B.R. Pelling, "Thucydides' Archidamus and Herodotus' Artabanus," in M.A. Flower and M. Toher (eds.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Calkwell* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1991), 140.

Is it reasonable to contend that Xerxes was the victim of fate? Did the gods, according to Herodotus, intend to bring down a proud, wealthy, and powerful Persian empire? Did the gods initiate the Persian Wars in order to punish a group of people who collectively were guilty of *hybris*?[51] To answer such questions, it seems best to find textual evidence that supports a divine role in the Persian Wars.

There is a plethora of textual evidence which points to the possibility that, to Herodotus, the Persian Wars are the result of divine retribution. The textual evidence includes the following: a) the many instances in which the Persians are guilty of crimes against the divine b) the many acts of divine retribution against the Persians, c) statements that clearly point to a divine cause behind the conflict/an external determinism controlling Persian fate (i.e., a divine hand guiding the events), and d) instances in which Xerxes and his generation of Persians are guilty of acts of *hybris*.

Incidents of temple desecration abound in the *Histories*, and ultimately in time, the perpetrator(s) are punished by divine retribution. In fact, Mikalson suggests that burning and destroying temples of gods and heroes is part of a dominant religious theme in Herodotus' account of the Persian Wars.[52] For instance, Herodotus speculates that the Persians who were routed by the Lacedaemonians at Plataea were guilty of sacrilege at a temple of Demeter,[53] and that the goddess therefore contributed to the end result of the battle:[54]

---

[50] Evans, "Imperialist Impulse," 37.

[51] Scholars have diverse viewpoints on the possibility that Xerxes and the Persians were drawn into battle against the Greeks so that the gods might bring retribution against the haughty nation of Persia. For instance, Lateiner does not believe that Herodotus produces a theological explanation of the Persian Wars. Furthermore, as mentioned above, he does not accept external determinism or fatalism in the *Histories*. Finally, Lateiner asks, "[i]f, however, Xerxes had been no more than the gods' joke, a victim, would Herodotus have written his history at all?" (*Historical Method*, 197-198, 204). Dewald, on the other hand, finds a divine cause for the Persian Wars to be plausible: "The point of the dream sequence is that the gods do intend the Persian invasion of Greece to happen, just as they intended the death of Croesus' son, 1.34" ("Explanatory Notes," 697). For a similar view to that of Dewald, see John Hart, *Herodotus and Greek History* (London: Croom Helm Ltd, 1982), 31.

> I find it surprising that although the battle took place by the grove of Demeter[55] not a single Persian, as it turned out, either entered the precinct or died in there; most of them fell around the outside of the sanctuary on the unconsecrated ground. In so far as one may speculate about divine matters, I think that the goddess herself kept them away because they had burnt her temple in Eleusis. (9.65)

It is worth mentioning that in addition to Plataea, divine retribution is active during other critical points of the Persian Wars, including Artemisium and Salamis.

In addition to the account above, the Persians are responsible for temple desecration throughout the Persian Wars (6.19, 96; 8.33, 53, 109, 129; 9.65), and thus are the recipients of divine retribution on several occasions.

> The burning of sanctuaries, as reprisals [for burning the temple of Cybebe at Sardis in 5.102], would become a distinctive feature of the forthcoming Persian attacks on the Greeks [beginning with their revenge in 6.101] for the next

---

[52] Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion*, 134.

[53] For other instances in which divine providence is associated with Demeter and her temple, see 8.65 (Salamis) and 9.100-101 (Mycale).

[54] In regards to divine providence during Plataea, Mikalson suggests the following: "The various 'religious episodes at the beginning and in the course of Plataea… are firmly grounded in cultic conventions and in local Plataean deities and sanctuaries. All rings true to a historian of Greek religion, and it is improbable that Herodotus, Plutarch, or their sources concocted such an account out of thin air. The account may have been later dramatized, as in Plutarch, but many of the heroes were local, known previously to Plataeans, and the gods linked to real Plataean sanctuaries. The overall effect is more than one of verisimilitude; it is that such events actually happened and were thought by Plataeans and other Greeks to have affected the course of action of the action of this critical battle" (*Herodotus and Religion*, 96-97).

[55] Herodotus rarely attributes divine retribution to an identified divinity, in this case Demeter, as he usually refers to the divine in general terms, such as "the divine", "the gods", or "the god". As mentioned above, Xenophon uses similar abstractions to identify divinity. For a discussion on the use of these general terms, see Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion*, 131-35.

> eighteen years, and it was in this gross impiety that Herodotus would find one of the major causes of the ultimate defeat of Persians.[56]

In fact, in Themistocles' speech (8.109), Xerxes is referred to as "[a] man who does not distinguish between sacred and profane things, but burns and topples the statues of gods." Similarly, Alexander attempts to sway the Athenians over to the Persian side (8.143-144) and is met with the following response: "... we will never come to terms with Xerxes.... we will take the field and fight against him, *confident of the support of gods and heroes* for whom he felt such utter contempt that *he burnt their homes and statues*."[57] Both statements illustrate Persian sacrilege, and the second one alludes to divine retribution for such transgressions.

Herodotus provides accounts in which Persians are punished via divine retribution for their temple desecration, thus, providing instances in which divine retribution is synonymous with historical causation (see 8.129; 8.135-139). For instance, when a tide is responsible for Persian casualties, the people of Potidaea attribute the flood tide to Poseidon, because the deceased Persians were the same ones who desecrated the cult statue in the temple of Poseidon.[58] It is evident that Herodotus agrees with the people of Potidaea when he responds: "Personally, I think that this explanation of events is correct" (8.129). This is an explicit case of divine retribution as historical causation.

---

[56] Mikalson, Herodotus and Religion, 25.

[57] My emphasis.

[58] In this instance, Herodotus ties together crime and punishment. Interestingly in the *Hellenica*, although not a case of temple desecration, Xenophon ties together crime and punishment in a similar manner. In 5.4.8, the Thebans released from prison break an oath with the Spartans and kill all enemies whom they see, and massacre children (5.4.11-12). Almost immediately after the massacre, the Spartan king Cleombrotus and his army kill 150 Thebans, whom Xenophon importantly identifies as the ones released from prison (5.4.14). "This detail allows the reader to identify the Thebans killed by Cleombrotus as the Thebans released from prison in *Hellenica* 5.4.12. This subtle identification allows Xenophon to link crime neatly with punishment" (Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 258).

The Persians plan to sack the temple at Delphi and bring its wealth back to Xerxes, and when the inhabitants of Delphi find out about the intentions of the Persians, they become terrified and ask if they should bury the sacred treasures. However, Apollo tells them that he is capable of protecting his own temple and its contents. As the Persians approach the temple, the god's prophet sees that the temple's sacred weapons, too sacred for any human to touch, are lying in front of the building. Furthermore, in approach to the sanctuary of Athena before the temple, thunderbolts crash down the Persians and two crags from a mountain fall on many of them, just as a war cry emerges from the temple. As a result, the Persians run away, and those who make it safely to Boeotia claim that they were pursued by two heavily armed men of superhuman height, that is, two local heroes of Delphi (8.35-39; cf. 2 Macc. 3:24-26).

The Persians were the objects of divine retribution during the Persian Wars and in key battles in particular. For instance, the gods create a great storm that precedes Artemisium, a critical sea battle, with the purpose of reducing the number of vessels in the Persian fleet. According to Herodotus, while the Greeks were protecting Euboea, a great Persian fleet (vastly outnumbering that of the Greeks) was moving down coast to attack, when a disastrous storm struck, depleting the Persian fleet. As a result, this pivotal battle was fought to a bloody stalemate, although Herodotus tells us that "Persians came off far worse" (8.16). To what does Herodotus attribute the great storm? "*This all happened by divine* *will*, to reduce the Persians' numerical advantage and bring their forces down to the level of the Greeks" (8.13).[59]

In the *Histories*, on more than one occasion, statements explicitly indicate that Xerxes, and the Persians, are at the will of the gods; that is, an external determinism already has decided the fate of the Persians. For instance, when Artabanus, disguised as Xerxes, experiences one of Xerxes' night visions for himself, he is informed: "Well you will not escape punishment, either now or in the future, for trying to deflect the *inevitable*. And Xerxes has already had the consequences of future disobedience explained to him" (7.17).[60] Other passages that follow the motif of the predetermined fate of the Persians include 8.65 ("The fate of Xerxes' army is in the hands of the god… so they realized that Xerxes' fleet was destined to be destroyed.") and 9.16 ("an event decreed by the god cannot be averted by man… A great many Persians are well aware… but we follow our leaders because we have no choice.").

In addition to 7.8 (see above), numerous passages illustrate and define Persian *hybris*: Xerxes ordering a canal to be built out of a sense of grandiosity and arrogance so that he can display his power and leave a memorial (7.24); Xerxes' punishment of the Hellespont (7.35); Xerxes' statement that "… there's no other human force that will resist us" (7.53); Xerxes wishing to divert a river (7.128); Xerxes' enormous military (7.184-186); the Persian army drinking a Thessalian river dry (7.196), and Themistocles' speech about Xerxes' sacrilege (8.109).

---

[59] My emphasis.
[60] My emphasis.

Finally, after Plataea, as some Greeks survey an affluent Persian camp, Pausanias assesses the extent of the Persian *hybris*: "Look at the way he lives, and then consider that he invaded our country to rob us of our meagre portions" (9.82). This final reference points to both *hybris* and Herodotus' dichotomy between soft and hard peoples; "soft peoples are characterized by luxury, the division of labor, and complexity of *nomos*, especially in the sphere of religion; hard peoples are simple, harsh, and fierce."[61] Additionally, 9.82 alludes to a uniform Persian policy practiced by Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, and Xerxes, and thus re-asserts the continuity of Persian *nomos* from Cyrus to Xerxes. Cyrus' attack on the Massagetae, resembling the proto-typical hard people, the Scythians, is an act of *hybris* for which he pays with his life (1.211-214). Similarly, not only is Darius' attack on the proto-typical hard people, the Scythians, a complete disaster, but it also contrasts the Scythians with the proto-typical soft peoples, the Ionians (4.142). In the same pattern as that of his predecessors, Xerxes leads his soft army, which includes Ionians, against the hard Greeks. In all three cases, the Persians suffer great losses by trying to add hard peoples, who have little wealth, to their empire. In other words, Persian imperialism, excessiveness, and *hybris* (7.8) become detrimental, and on more than one occasion, result in punishment and defeat of the imperial power. The wise advisor Artabanus cautions Xerxes about this very point.

> It wasn't so much that I was upset at being rebuked by you, but that when the Persians were faced with two plans, one of which would increase our abusiveness, while the other would curb it, by pointing out how wrong it is to train the mind to be constantly seeking more than it has at the moment... what really upset me was that you chose the one which would be more dangerous not only for yourself, but for Persia too. (7.16)

---

[61] Redfield, "Herodotus the Tourist," 109.

Further, Artabanus reminds Xerxes of the failed campaigns, Cyrus against the Massagetae, Cambyses against the Ethiopians, and Darius against the Scythians (7.18). Thus, expansion, luxury, and greed transformed the Persians into soft people, which in turn rendered them incapable of conquering the character of hard people.

Interestingly, Herodotus chose to end the *Histories* on this very point, and ironically with words of Cyrus. Cyrus receives a proposal advocating Persian expansion from their small and rugged country in pursuit of wealth and luxury (9.121). However, an unimpressed Cyrus responds that they would become subjects rather than rulers since soft lands breed soft people. Furthermore, it is better to live on a harsh land and rule than to cultivate fertile lands and be slaves (9.122). In Redfield's words: "The soft, complex people… can be conquered, but in defeat they take their revenge by transforming the conqueror. They soften him, and at the same time fill him with just that irrational insatiability which will lead him to destruction."[62]

Since he is responsible for the first act of Persian imperialism and *hybris*, it is significant that Cyrus provides the final words of didactic wisdom in the *Histories*. The narrative patterns of *hybris*, imperialism, and divine retribution seem to create a metanarrative which is evident in Herodotus' [illegible]resentation of all Persian kings. Each Persian king is punished individually but the ultimate punishment comes at the end of the *Histories* when the Greeks successfully prevail over their Persian nemesis. The Greek gods' ultimate punishment of the

---

[62] Redfield, "Herodotus the Tourist," 113.

Persians is not directed at Xerxes alone, but all Persian kings who followed the same Persian imperial *nomos*. Xerxes, like Zedekiah in Chronicles, is merely the ruler at the time of the ultimate punishment for a nation's impious deeds.

6.6.3 The End of Spartan Hegemony

As is this case in Chronicles and the *Histories*, in the *Hellenica*, political and military success is contingent upon proper behaviour towards the gods.[63] Similar to Herodotus' explanation for the defeat of the Persians, Xenophon suggests that the imperialistic Spartans are defeated by divine retribution because of their various acts of impiety, most importantly, oath-breaking.[64] Xenophon writes:

> Many examples could be given from Greek and foreign history to show that the gods are not indifferent to irreligion or to evil doing. Here I shall mention only the case which occurs at this point in my narrative. The Spartans had sworn to leave the cities independent, and then they had seized the Acropolis of Thebes. Now they were punished by these men alone, whom they had wronged, although before that time they had never been conquered by any other nation on earth; and as for the Thebans who had brought them into the Acropolis with the aim of enslaving their city to Sparta so that they might act as dictators there themselves, it took only seven men from the exiled party to put an end to their government. I shall now tell the story of how this happened. (5.4.1)

The Spartans intentionally break another oath immediately before the Battle of Leuctra, when they suffer a defeat that arrests their aspirations for hegemony. Before the battle, Prothous, acting in a manner similar to that of a Herodotean wise advisor, advises the Spartans to disband their army in order to win favour with the gods and provoke the least possible discontent from the cities (6.4.2); however, a Spartan assembly passes off the advice as nonsense, and it is at this point that Xenophon informs the reader: "It looks as though they were already being impelled by some divine power" (6.4.3). It appears as though the gods guide the Spartans toward a losing battle.[65] "Xenophon thus foreshadows the Spartan defeat at Leuctra and links it to their oath-breaking in the preliminaries to the campaign."[66]

---

[63] Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 84.
[64] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 256.

During the Battle of Leuctra (6.4.7), a number of supernatural events occur; the doors of all the temples in the region open on their own and the weapons from the temple of Heracles disappear.

> Reports also came from Thebes to the effect that the doors of temple were opening of their own accord and that the priestesses were saying that the gods were giving clear signs of victory. It is also said that the arms in the temple of Heracles had disappeared, showing that Heracles himself had set out for battle.[67] (6.4.7)

Although Xenophon suggests that these supernatural occurrences were the tricks of the Theban leaders, he immediately states, "… everything certainly went badly for the Spartans, and everything, including luck, was on the side of the Thebans" (6.4.8). Pownall concludes that "[t]he logical conclusion is that Xenophon reports these supernatural occurrences in order to reinforce his contention that the gods punish the Spartans at Leuctra for their impiety."[68] Similarly, Tuplin maintains that "[i]t is surely clear, especially when one examines the distribution of direct comments by Xenophon about divine intervention, that the role of higher forces at Leuctra is a consequence of the divine anger which descended upon Sparta because of the seizure of the Cadmeia."[69]

---

[65] This may be comparable to Xerxes' deceptive dreams and YHWH's deception of Ahab (2 Chron. 18:11-34). This motif will be explored in greater detail in the following chapter.
[66] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 257. According to Dillery, For Xenophon there was no greater act of impiety than breaking an oath (*History of His Times,* 184).
[67] This is similar to when Apollo protects Delphi from the Persians (*Histories*, 8.25-39).
[68] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 257.
[69] Christopher Tuplin, *The Failings of Empire: A Reading of Xenophon Hellenica* (Historia Einzelschriften 76; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993), 134.

The link between the impious act in 5.4.1 and the subsequent punishment in 6.4.7 is evident, as Xenophon greatly emphasizes the single event as the cause of Sparta's demise. The association between the events is extended in that the Spartans, who had never been defeated, are brought down by those whom they had harmed.[70] Furthermore, it takes only seven men to defeat the puppet regime at Thebes. Considering the unusual circumstances of defeat, the gods must be perceived as the driving force behind such "remarkable and unprecedented events."[71] In a speech with a Herodotean-like tone to it, Jason of Pherae states: "It seems, too, that heaven takes pleasure in raising up the small and bringing down the great" (6.4.23-24). The Spartans, like the Persians in the *Histories*, suffer a military defeat at the hands of an underdog enemy because of divine retribution.[72]

Importantly, Dillery suggests that in addition to the seizure of the Cadmea, the Spartans are on a course of self-destruction in which they ignore the will of the gods; that is, the Spartans are on an impious descent during which they commit a series of crimes that culminates in their seizure of the Theban Acropolis. "In a sense, then, it was not just a mistaken action for which Sparta was punished, but a set of actions."[73] However, the Spartan seizure of the Theban Acropolis is the most explicit example of Sparta's self-destructive imperial policy which results in divine retribution.[74] Dillery believes that Xenophon's account of the capture of the Theban acropolis is unique because it is an episode shaped by an individual or group of individuals, as well as an episode in which an entire state is responsible; "with the Cadmea [Theban acropolis] alone is the connection between individual and state explicitly made."[75]

---

[70] Cf. *Hellenica* 5.4.11-14 and *Histories* 8.129.

[71] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 222.

[72] Cf. 2 Chron. 13:13-17; 14:8-13; 20:15-24; 24:24; 32:1-21.

[73] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 227. See Dillery's entire discussion of 5.4.1 (*History of His Times*, 221-37).

[74] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 7.

Between 385 and 384 BCE, the Spartans begin to punish those allies who opposed them in the Corinthian War. The Spartan campaign begins with Mantinea (5.2.2-7). Because Mantinea would not tear down its fortifications, the Spartans lay waste to Mantinea's land (5.2.4), dig a trench around the city (5.2.4), dam the river which overflows and creates a flood (5.2.4), and destroy the fortifications and move the population into four villages (5.2.7). According to Dillery:

> Xenophon is establishing themes he will highlight throughout the rest of the book. Although Mantinea may not be the clearest case of Sparta's new imperialism, it nonetheless contains elements that will resonate with other episodes that are less ambiguous. We notice problems of leadership; we also glimpse a kind of opportunism, a propensity to modify plans to maximize Sparta's advantage. Xenophon is introducing into his narrative patterns of action that will help account for episodes of greater significance later on – namely the seizure of the Cadmea.[76]

Following the Mantinea episode, when Agesilaus is about to campaign against Phlius, a community that is greatly admired by Xenophon for its courage, self-control, and unity, the Phlisians beg him not invade. However, the only way in which Agesilaus will not invade is if the Phlisians surrender their acropolis to Sparta (5.3.15); the Phlisians refuse Agesilaus' demand so the Spartan king lays siege to the city (5.3.14-16) and implements a provisional government with the authority to put citizens to death (5.3.23-25). Dillery notes that it is at this point when Sparta becomes very oppressive. "The complete and radical destruction of autonomy at Mantinea and Phlius, while perhaps not forbidden by the Peace (if neither was an official member of the Peace), is presented in terms that point to grotesque violations of the spirit of the Peace."[77] According to Tuplin, "... Xenophon has depicted the Spartan alliance (the methods of controlling which we have seen exemplified at Mantinea and Phlius) lumbering into action for purely imperialistic motives."[78] Thus, these episodes begin a pattern of Spartan imperialism and cumulative impiety.

---

[75] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 236.
[76] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 209.

In 382 BCE, Phoebidas, whom Xenophon characterizes as a man without strength and self-control (5.2.28), captures the Theban acropolis while the Theban women are celebrating the Thesmophoria (5.2.29). Because he captures the Cadmea without authorization from the state, many Spartans disapprove of Phoebidas' actions, but Agesilaus defends his friend: "If the action of Phoebidas is harmful to Sparta, then he deserves to be punished... The point to be examined, therefore, is simply this: has this action been good or bad for Sparta?" (5.2.32). Agesilaus' speech exhibits Sparta's imperialism, arrogance, and general disregard for others, all of which form the larger pattern of Sparta's impiety.[79] Thus, when the Spartans under the command of Cleombrotus are defeated at Leuctra, it is punishment for Sparta's imperial policy, to which several individuals, including Agesilaus, Phoebidas, and Cleombrotus, contribute. The crimes committed against other cities beginning in 385 BCE led to the punishment of the Spartans at Leuctra in 371 BCE.

In Tuplin's view, the Spartans provide examples of what *not* to do, as the behaviour of the "Spartan state and its agents" on the international stage presents a "sorry spectacle." "For there is quite a roll call of incompetent Spartan generals, men who are defeated—and in most cases killed—through carelessness or arrogance."[80] Similar to the Persians in the *Histories*, the collective Spartan foreign policies result in imperialism, greed, excess, arrogance, neglect of law, and perhaps most importantly, neglect of the divine.[81] The significance of the point is illustrated in the *Cyropaedia* when Cambyses gives advice to his son, a young Cyrus the Great.

---

[77] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 213.
[78] Tuplin, *Failings of Empire*, 96.
[79] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 216-18.

> Thus human wisdom no more knows how to choose what is best than if someone, casting lots, should do whatever the lots determines. Yet the gods, son, being eternal, know all that has come to be, all that is, and all that will result from each of these things. And, of the human beings who seek counsel, to whomever they may be propitious, they give signs as to what they ought to do and what they ought not, If they are not willing to give counsel to all, it is no matter for wonder, for there is no necessity for them to care for anyone or anything unless they want to. (1.6.46)[82]

Xenophon believed that the gods supervise all mortals and their actions and reward the pious. Thus, the continued success of a community is the result of piety and the cessation of a community signaled impiety, and therefore, a loss of favour with the gods.[83] In this regard, the parallels in Chronicles are numerous, including Chronicles' narrative of the destruction of the temple in 2 Chronicles 36. To Xenophon, Sparta had changed for the worse. "In his eyes Sparta had become a place where people did not know what was really good for them; a reckless people bent on supreme rule and consequently doomed to self-destruction: they were, in fact, a great deal like the Thirty."[84]

---

[80] Tuplin, *Failings of Empire*, 164.

[81] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 193.

[82] Xenophon, *The Education of Cyrus* (Trans. Wayne Ambler; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 59.

[83] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 189.

[84] Dillery, *History of His Times*, 193.

6.7 Analysis

If Dillery is correct, then Xenophon's model of individual and immediate retribution may not be as mechanical as it may seem at first. Furthermore, if Dillery is correct, then as is the case in Chronicles and the *Histories*, acts of divine retribution during the central events of Xenophon's historiography are a combination of both immediate retribution and deferred punishment; that is, like Zedekiah in Chronicles and Xerxes in the *Histories*, both of whom are afflicted by immediate retribution, Cleombrotus and the Spartans at Leuctra, also punished immediately, are merely the final transgressors in a succession of impious Spartans. Cleombrotus is similar to Zedekiah and Xerxes in that he merely is continuing a nation's impiety, carrying the cumulative transgressions of a nation, and being impelled by divine force (6.4.3). In the cases of Cleombrotus and Xerxes, they continue their predecessors' imperial policies. However, unlike the multi-generational transgressions in Chronicles and the *Histories*, the Spartan violations of the social centre in the *Hellenica* occur during the same generation.

In the three texts discussed above, divine retribution, which brings about the disaster of an entity, is the result of continuous violations of the primary narrative's social centre, and each text had its own unique social centre which in turn created a unique discourse. Despite the unique social centre in each respective text, the use of immediate retribution and deferred punishment in the three discourses is apparent. This being said, it is important to mention that disaster has different meaning in each discourse.

In Chronicles, disaster comes near the end of the narrative, just before the concluding remarks about Cyrus and the rebuilding of the temple, in the form of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple of YHWH, both of which are part of the social centre of the narrative. Thus, destruction would arouse feelings of lament and devastation in the intended audience (i.e., a temple-centered community in Persian Yehud). Finally, the destruction of the temple means that the temple ceased to exist at the end of the primary narrative.

This is, of course, very different from what disaster signifies in the *Histories*. Disaster, which also comes near the end of the primary narrative, had at least two meanings in the *Histories*, one good and the other not so good. First, disaster is the social memory of the disastrous Persian campaign against Greece, events which recall the Greeks coming together to repulse a powerful imperial force. Additionally, it is important to mention that the defeat of the Persians is also dissimilar to disaster in Chronicles in that the Persian empire continued to exist as an imperial power well after Xerxes until 330 BCE (Darius III), when Alexander's army ended Persian dominion in the Near East and Mediterranean—this is, of course, entirely different from the destruction of building which ceases to exist after it is reduced to rubble and the people in the community are exiled. Second, the *Histories* was predicting a possibly imminent and similar disaster for the late fifth century BCE Athenians, who became the most recent incarnation of the Lydians or Persians.

Disaster in the *Hellenica* is the defeat of Sparta, a political entity which Xenophon associated with order and stability.[85] In the *Hellenica*, unlike in Chronicles and the *Histories*, disaster does not occur at the end of the primary narrative; thus, the narrative continues well beyond the disastrous event. Furthermore, Sparta, like the Persian empire, continued to exist as a political entity and therefore disaster was the end of Sparta not as a people but as a hegemonic entity—a loss of status that the Persians do not experience after their disastrous defeat in the *Histories*.

---

[85] According to Dillery, for Xenophon, as well as for Plato, change is equivalent to decline. "For Plato, too, change is really decline… *Laws* 3 not only provides a roughly contemporary parallel for Xenophon's view of change, it also suggests a very important point regarding the position of Sparta in the imagination of intellectuals of the mid-fourth century. Sparta was revered by men like Xenophon and Plato precisely because it was thought to have remained unchanged over time, a symbol of stability and order (Dillery, *History of His Times*, 191).

7. Prophetic Figures in Chronicles and Wise Advisors in the *Histories*

7.1 The Roles of Prophetic Figures and Wise Advisors

In Chronicles, a prophet (2 Chron. 12:5-7; 20:37; 21:12; 25:15; 28:9), a seer (2 Chron. 16:7), a man of God (2 Chron. 25:7), a Levite (2 Chron. 20:14), a priest (2 Chron. 24:20), a king (2 Chron. 35:21), or any other ad hoc prophet may fulfil the role of the prophetic figure.[1] Prophetic figures interpret historical events within the context of divine retribution, predict immediate future events, warn, and exhort.[2]

In many instances, prophetic figures provide warnings and exhortations for kings, and if a king fails to heed a prophetic message, he becomes an object of divine retribution. Amit suggests that the institutions of prophecy and monarchy are associated, even so closely that Davidic monarchs can act as prophetic figures (1 Chron. 22:17-19; 2 Chron. 20:20; 29:5-11; 30:6-9; 32:7-8).[3] Moreover, whenever the link between a Davidic king and YHWH is broken because of misconduct by the kings, prophetic figures are deployed to warn and exhort. In other words, the king is the one who determines the course of history, which is, of course, contingent upon his actions, while the prophetic figure merely interprets and directs. A king who seeks YHWH by following God's ways does not require a prophetic figure, and if one appears, encouragement is offered. However, those who do not seek YHWH and dismiss the prophetic word are punished.[4] Thus, prophetic figures maintain and protect the social centre of the text by warning kings who do not seek YHWH, and when prophetic words go unheeded, YHWH punishes the violator.

---

[1] I do not share William Schniedewind's (*The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* [JSOTSup 197; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], 80-129) view on a distinction between "prophets" and "inspired messengers", because, in my view, anyone who utters a prophetic utterance in Chronicles is a prophetic figure, who seems to serve similar purposes within the narrative; that is, regardless of the proper title of the prophet in Chronicles, either prophet or otherwise, the character warns and/or exhorts. *Contra* Schniedewind, see Rex Mason, *Preaching the Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 137. Mason states: "Whether or not, then, the speakers are named or given genealogies, and however they are described, they all seem to be doing and saying very similar things… All we can say is that there is a certain broad fitness in the themes of the addresses given to kings, priests, or prophetic figures. Beyond that we can say only that the Chr sees them all as 'messengers'."

[2] It should be noted that prophetic figures in Chronicles do not fit the mold of the literary/ideological characters of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Micah, and other biblical prophets.

[3] See Yairah Amit, "The Role of Prophecy and Prophets in the Chronicler's World," in M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak (eds.), *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427; New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 80-101. Amit's observation is correct; however, it is important to add that a main or an authoritative character in a particular narrative can fulfil a prophetic role. For instance, a foreign king, Pharaoh Neco, fulfils the role of the prophetic figure in 2 Chron. 35:21. Significantly, in Chronicles, although foreign kings (Neco and Cyrus) can communicate the word of YHWH, Northern kings do not have the ability to do so. Ben Zvi posits that this is because Necho and Cyrus are legitimate

Since Asa both heeds and ignores prophetic exhortations, he provides a good example of how the role of the prophetic figure functions in Chronicles. At the beginning of his reign, he seeks YHWH and, as a result, prospers (2 Chron. 14:2-7).[5] When Asa seeks YHWH, there is a direct link, or open connection, between him and God; Asa calls on YHWH to help him in battle against Zerah the Ethiopian (14:11), a plea which results in the destruction of Zerah and his army, as well as much plunder for Asa (14:12-15). Immediately thereafter, Azariah advises Asa that YHWH is with the king when he seeks YHWH and warns that if Asa forsakes God, he too will be forsaken (15:2). Azariah furthers

---

kings in Chronicles but the Northern monarchs are depicted as being illegitimate kings ("A House of Treasures," 25-26).

[4] Amit, "Role of Prophecy."

[5] He removes foreign altars and high places, tears down pillars, and cuts down the *asherim* (14:3-5), actions which in turn produce great reward, as he is rewarded with peace and building projects (14:5-7).

the warning when he interprets historical events within the context of the seeking YHWH paradigm and of divine retribution (15:3-7). Asa responds by seeking YHWH, removing idols, restoring the altar of YHWH, punishing those who do not, and removing his idolatrous mother (15:8-16). The pious Asa is rewarded with the cessation of war until the thirty-fifth year of his reign (15:19).

However, in the thirty-sixth year of Asa's reign, Baasha king of Israel comes against Judah, and instead of seeking YHWH, as he did in his battle against Zerah the Ethiopian, Asa turns to Ben-Hadad of Aram to facilitate a treaty with him against Baasha (16:2-3). This act, of course, violates Azariah's warning about seeking YHWH. Subsequently, Hanani the seer appears, provides Asa with an interpretation of the events, and warns of continual wars as punishment for not seeking YHWH (16:7-9). In the thirty-ninth year of his reign, Asa becomes diseased in his feet, and instead of seeking YHWH, he seeks the help of physicians and dies soon after (16:12-13). Thus, Asa does not heed Azariah's warning, and consequently, he meets an end via divine retribution

Comparable to the prophetic figure in Chronicles, the wise advisor in the *Histories* recurs throughout the narrative under a variety of guises and with a variety of names. The wise advisor may be male or female, a king's counsellor (1.207; 3.36; 4.83; 7.10, 46-49, 51) or a king himself (3.40; 9.122), or may even be a little girl, such as Gorgo (5.51), Cleomenes' daughter. Lattimore distinguishes between the two types of wise advisors, the "tragic warner" and the "practical advisor", and since the two are not mutually exclusive, their roles may overlap. Just as the prophetic figure does in Chronicles, the tragic warner often attempts to caution an arrogant and headstrong leader against doing or continuing a certain action. The tragic warner usually is pessimistic, unheeded, and correct. When the advice of the tragic warner goes unheeded, disaster and retribution strike the headstrong leader—the same result occurs when a king fails to heed the admonitions of a prophetic figure in Chronicles. The practical advisor, on the other hand, generally gives sound advice which is accepted with positive results.[6] Furthermore, according to Immerwahr, the effect of the advice is contingent upon its acceptance or rejection.[7] This is also the case in Chronicles—if a king heeds the advice, he is rewarded but if the prophetic word is ignored, the king is punished.

7.2 Direct Speech in Chronicles and the Histories[8]

Direct discourse in Chronicles and the *Histories* are not quotes of "actual" speeches made by characters but rather served the rhetorical function of authenticating core messages in the texts. In other words, when a character engages in direct discourse, the narrator's message still prevails. Bal maintains that "[t]he traditional distinction between 'I'-narratives and 'he'-narratives is... inadequate not only for terminological reasons."[9] Similarly, Booth contends that "[t]o say that a story is told in the first or the third person will tell us nothing of importance unless we become more precise and describe how the particular qualities of the narrators relate to specific effects."[10] For instance, suppose a person writes, "'I think that Edmonton is cold in the winter.'" Is this any different than if the same person writes, "Edmonton is cold in the winter"? In both instances, the same individual has used two different ways to convey the same message—this is the manner in which direct discourse works in Chronicles and the *Histories*.

---

[6] Lattimore, "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus," 24-35. Also see Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, 72-78.

[7] Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, 74.

[8] It should be noted that direct discourse is not limited to ancient Israelite and Greek historiographies. Fictional Akkadian autobiographies, Royal Assyrian Inscriptions, Neo-Babylonian building inscriptions, Cyrus Cylinder, The Autobiography of Idrimi, The Proclamation of Telepinu, Apology of Hattušili, and The Inscription of King Mesha are just a few of many examples of ancient Near Eastern historical discourses containing direct discourse. In ancient Near Eastern literature, the narrator voice tells us very little about the author; that is, we know no more about an author of a text narrated in the first-person than we do about a text narrated in the third-person. For instance, it is hardly likely that Naram-Sin was responsible for the composition of the Cuthean Legend, just as it is hardly likely that Cyrus is the author of the Cyrus Cylinder for that matter, and therefore, the identity of the author(s) of these texts is revealed no more than it is in the Book of Kings.

Duke considers direct discourse in Chronicles to be an external proof which gives authority, support, and authentication to teachings presented in Chronicles. External proof is material which supposedly is not created by the speaker or writer but is derived from external sources and is used to support an argument; it may include eyewitness testimony, physical evidence, and letters or other documents. In Chronicles, in addition to speeches, other conventions such as genealogies, lists, and citation of sources also function as external proofs. Duke adds that it is irrelevant if these are authentic or fabricated, since they function rhetorically as external proofs.

Direct discourse is an effective external proof in that it purports to be not the words of the narrator, but rather the testimony of other people, who usually are authoritative figures such as kings, prophetic figures, and YHWH. Even if the words in direct discourse are similar to those of the narrator and reflect the narrator's theological principles and teachings, the authoritative third party authenticates the content and its messages. For such reasons, the narrator of Chronicles does not have to depend only on its own authority. Finally, many instances of direct speech in Chronicles, either implicitly or explicitly, involve the paradigm of seeking YHWH; therefore, direct discourse functions to imprint the paradigm on the minds of the intended audience.[11] Thus, prophetic speeches authenticate a central doctrine of Chronicles: those who worship properly and seek YHWH prosper (military victories, peace, wisdom, wealth, building projects, many children, etc.), while those who turn away from YHWH and his cult and do not heed the prophetic word are punished (military defeat, illness or death, rebellion of the people, etc.).

---

[9] Bal, *Narratology*, 29.
[10] Booth, "Types of Narration," 147.

Duke's model of the rhetorical device of direct discourse in Chronicles is also applicable to Herodotus' *Histories.* Flower and Marincola posit that wise advisor speeches "…are especially effective and receive most of their power because they are employed by an external narrator, who… already knows the end towards which [Herodotus'] history is moving."[12] It should be noted that direct discourse seems to function differently in Herodotus' *Histories* and Xenophon's *Hellenica* than it does in other Greek historiography.[13] Herodotus and Xenophon appear to have used speeches more for rhetorical and moralizing purposes than did other Greek historians.

---

[11] Duke, "A Rhetorical Approach," 129-32.

[12] Flower and Marincola, *Herodotus Histories Book IX*, 7-8.

[13] Fornara posits that beginning with Thucydides, who regarded direct discourse as a genre with laws and requirements of its own, speeches were treated like events and therefore had to be

> Almost all ancient historians used formal speeches, but they used them in different ways. Xenophon's speeches have more in common with those of Herodotus than Thucydides. He shares with Herodotus the view that speeches were *memorials* to ethical qualities... He also shares with Herodotus the observance of the virtue of propriety in composing speeches that contributed to the illustration of ethical achievement.[14]

Pownall maintains Xenophon employed formal speeches to instill his moral lessons in the reader by allowing the moral qualities of the speaker to reveal themselves rather than guiding the reader with explicit comments.[15] For instance, in Xenophon's *Hellenica*, Theramenes gives a speech that the author uses to direct the reader's attention to the impiety of the Thirty Tyrants of Athens, who violate sanctuary by dragging Theramenes to his death from the altar at which he has taken refuge. Theramenes' speech refers to the Thirty's impiety toward the gods, for which they are punished soon after. Pownall notes that by means of Theramenes' speech, Xenophon directs the reader's attention to the Thirty's violation of sanctuary without passing judgment himself.[16]

Similarly, in the *Histories*, direct discourse by authoritative figures represents and authenticates the *Histories*' social centre and didactic lessons.

---

reported accurately (or at least accepted as such by intended audiences). For a discussion on speeches in Greek and Roman historiography, see Charles W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Greece and Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 142-68. The supposition that the way in which Herodotus and Xenophon used speeches is distinctly opposed to the manner in which Thucydides used them may be a construct of the modern reader. Perhaps those who perceive positivist methodology in Thucydides' discourse, and not in those of Herodotus and Xenophon, impose this distinction on the use of speeches.

[14] Vivienne Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 139.

[15] Pownall, *Lessons from the Past*, 97-98.

[16] Pownall, "Condemnation of the Impious," 259.

Herodotus reinforces his core theme of moderation through speeches from authoritative wise advisors, including the Athenian law-giver Solon (1.32), Croesus king of Lydia (1.207), Pharaoh Amasis (3.40), and the great Athenian general Themistocles (8.109).[17] Comparable to the prophetic figure in Chronicles, the wise advisor in the *Histories* protects and maintains the social centre of the text. As Immerwahr has pointed out, "[t]he idea of moderation is most prominent in the famous warnings of Solon, Amasis, and Artabanus, since it is the fundamental idea in advice given by warners."[18]

7.3 Textual Examples

Textual examples from Chronicles and Herodotus' *Histories* in which direct speech emphasizes and authenticates the worldviews of each respective discourse will now be considered. Moreover, in each instance, an arrogant ruler dismisses the advice of a prophetic figure or wise advisor and subsequently meets an end via divine retribution. It is important to mention that examples from Chronicles will be read in tandem with examples from the *Histories* in order illustrate how the convention functions similarly in the two texts. In concentrating on the similarities of the two texts, it is not my intention to gloss over the differences or to suggest that these are similar stories. Rather, the following examples are from two texts with very different core messages; that is, as mentioned above, the Chronicles emphasizes the seeking YHWH paradigm, while

---

[17] See Harrison, *Divinity and History*, 31-63; Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, 77, 310-13.

[18] Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, 310.

Herodotus stresses moderation and the instability of human fortune. In other words, the abounding differences are self-evident.

7.3.1 AMAZIAH AND POLYCRATES. After Amaziah hires 100,000 Israelite mercenaries from the Northern Kingdom, a man of God advises him not to go to battle with the Israelite army because YHWH is with neither Israel nor Ephraim. Furthermore, the man of God warns that if Amaziah goes to battle with his mercenaries, God will bring him down, since YHWH has the power to help or harm (2 Chron. 25:7-8). Amaziah heeds the prophetic word and leaves the mercenaries behind, and as a result, is victorious in battle (25:10-13). Then after returning from slaughtering the Edomites, Amaziah inexplicably brings back and worships the gods of the defeated Edomites (25:14). As a result, an angry YHWH sends a prophet to Amaziah in order to advise him against his senseless idolatry, but the king interrupts the speech by asking the prophet if he has been appointed as a royal counsellor. The prophet recognizes that divine retribution is imminent, as he says, "I know that God has planned to destroy you, because you have done this, and have not listened to my counsel" (25:15-16).[19]

Amaziah's ignorance and arrogance are exhibited clearly when he challenges Joash king of Israel. Joash warns the Judahite king that his heart has become proud and boastful and that trouble will fall on Amaziah and Judah. However, Amaziah does not listen and God delivers him into the hand of Joash as retribution for seeking the gods of Edom, rather than YHWH, and for not heeding the prophetic word (25:17-20). Thereafter, Amaziah flees to Lachish where he is killed (25:27). Ben Zvi notes that "[u]nlike Kings (see 2 Kgs 14:19) Chronicles strongly suggests to its readers that the rebellion against Amaziah and his death occurred not too long after the king went astray…."[20] Chronicles emphatically associates the acts of turning away from YHWH and disregarding the prophetic word (i.e., the word of YHWH) with Amaziah's eventual demise via literary-chronological proximity.[21]

---

[19] Hoglund points out Chronicles' expansion of 2 Kgs 14:7-14. In the Kings account there is no man of God, no prophet, and no worship of Edomite gods (Kenneth G. Hoglund, "The Chronicler as Historian: A Comparativist Perspective," *Chronicler as Historian*, 24).

Similarly, Polycrates is successful in all of his military campaigns and he conquers many Aegean Islands and numerous mainland communities as well. He is so prosperous that he becomes the talk of all of Greece (3.39). Polycrates' success becomes a concern for his guest-friend Pharaoh Amasis[22] who writes a letter to warn him that continual fortune is dangerous since the gods are jealous of success. Furthermore, Amasis advises Polycrates that he has never encountered a person succeeding in all matters who did not meet a horrible end. Thus, Amasis advises Polycrates to throw away his most valuable possession in order to change his luck, for it is best to have a mix of good and bad luck (3.40). Polycrates heeds Amasis' advice and throws his prized ring into the sea (3.41); however, the gods already have decided Polycrates' fate, as his ring returns to him in the belly of a fish which a fisherman presents to him as a gift (3.42). Upon hearing the news,

---

[20] Ben Zvi, "A House of Treasures," 6.

[21] See Kalimi, "Literary-Chronological Proximity," 318-38.

[22] Interestingly, like Herodotus, Chronicles places prophetic words into the mouth of an Egyptian ruler, Pharaoh Neco (2 Chron. 35:21-22). However, the main difference is that Neco is a divinely inspired speaker, that is, he speaks the word of YHWH. Amasis, on the other hand, is a wise advisor, or tragic warner, who correctly interprets human instability and divine intentions.

Amasis realizes that one cannot save another from fate and that Polycrates will die a miserable death (3.43).

Polycrates finally meets his unfortunate end at the hands of Oroetes, who tricks him by the ruse of great wealth. The story goes that Polycrates plans to rule the sea, an act of *hybris* in itself, and Oroetes offers to help the over-ambitious Samian tyrant by sharing his fortune with him. However, Oroetes' offer is a trick to lure Polycrates to his death. Before Polycrates embarks on the voyage to his unfortunate end, he is warned by both oracles and friends; even Polycrates' daughter, who has a dream about his demise, tries to warn him about his arrangement with Oroetes. Nevertheless, Polycrates fails to heed the warnings of the wise advisors and dies a horrible death, as Amasis had warned; he is crucified just as his daughter had foreseen in her dream.

7.3.2 UZZIAH AND CROESUS. In 2 Chronicles 26, Uzziah's reign begins piously as he seeks YHWH (v. 5), a decision which results in divine assistance in his military victories (v. 6), tribute (v. 8), fame (v. 8), building projects (v. 10), and great military strength (vv. 11-15). However, when Uzziah becomes strong, he also becomes very arrogant, as "his heart was lifted up" (v. 16). Thus, Uzziah's excessive pride leads him to turn away from YHWH and attempt to burn incense in the temple (v. 16). Azariah the priest, along with eighty other priests, warns Uzziah not to burn incense on the incense altar in the temple because only priests are permitted to do so (v. 18).[23] The excessively proud Uzziah angrily dismisses the prophetic warning from the priests, an act which results immediately in a divinely afflicted case of leprosy. Uzziah is forced to live in a separate house, is cut off from the house of YHWH, and remains a leper until he dies (vv. 19-21).

---

[23] Num. 16:40; cf. Exod. 30:1-20; Num. 18:1-7.

In the Croesus narrative, as discussed in Chapter 3, Solon acknowledges that Croesus is both wealthy and powerful but informs him that wealth and power do not dictate luck and happiness. Furthermore, good health, fine children, good looks, and a heroic death are consistent with luck, which is not guaranteed to Croesus because of his wealth. Finally, Solon admonishes him, saying no mortal can have all blessings because the god offers prosperity to humans, but then destroys them in the end (1.32). Croesus, however, does not heed Solon's warning (1.33), a decision which initiates the Lydian king's rapid demise. Upon Solon's departure, divine retribution strikes Croesus (1.34), bringing about the death of his son (1.43) and the undoing of his wealth and power. It is, however, important to mention that the undoing of Croesus' wealth and power is due to both his and his ancestor Gyges' impiety; the demise of the Lydian kingdom is predetermined because of Gyges' actions four generations earlier.

7.4 Analysis

Both sets of textual examples share much in common. Amaziah and Polycrates act arrogantly and disregard prophetic warnings, and consequently, they become objects of divine retribution. Moreover, in both instances, the prophetic figure realizes that an arrogant king is fated to meet a disastrous end, that is, destruction by divine hand. Uzziah and Croesus are both arrogant kings who reject a warning and are punished immediately.

Despite the similarities, the narratives from Chronicles and the *Histories* are unique discourses in that they provide two very different audiences with distinct messages. Divine retribution ensues for different reasons in the two texts, and the characters who warn in each text teach different intended audiences unique lessons about the distinctive social centre of their respective tradition. In sum, there may be a resemblance in the *topos* of the admonishing figures in the two texts but the different core messages inserted into that structure formed a unique discourse for a specific audience.

Conclusions

Chronicles is an invaluable instrument with which to study ancient historiography. As has been illustrated in this study, using what appear to be common *topoi* and narrative patterns in ancient historiography, Chronicles is a historical narrative that was created from the core facts accepted by its community of readers. Chronicles, following the rules of the genre of historical writing as agreed upon by authorship and readership in its milieu, was accepted by its intended audience as a reliable and accurate presentation of the past. In Brettler's words, "… the Chronicler, along with members of his community, was so sure of certain political and religious ideologies that he rewrote the accepted version of history to conform (and to confirm) what he truly believed happened."[1] I agree with Brettler's statement; however, I do not agree with him that Chronicles represents a rewriting of "the accepted version of history". In my view, Chronicles is not a rewriting of the same history, but rather represents a writing of another history. In other words, Chronicles used the same core facts as its source, Samuel-Kings, to create "another history" by emplotting these same core facts in a unique manner that conformed to the expectations and beliefs of the text's readership and community. The way in which Chronicles and Josephus created new narratives from established core facts reveals a great deal about historical writing in ancient Israel.

By focusing on how external referents (i.e., past events) are narrated, rather than focusing on the historicity of the events themselves, it is possible to engage in intercultural comparisons and analyses of common *topoi* and narrative patterns used in ancient historiography. Such comparisons are particularly insightful in that they reveal that Chronicles employed *topoi* and narrative patterns common in the ancient historical discourses. Comparative studies divulge that Chronicles is in fact historiography in that it utilized accepted historiographical devices found in other historical discourses, and included the use of *topoi* and narrative patterns such as paradigmatic individuals, restorers of orders, and admonishing figures that appear to have been relatively widespread throughout the ancient Near East and Mediterranean.

---

[1] Brettler, *Creation of History*, 47.

Chapter 1 of this study discussed the formation of historical narratives by considering how the contemporary world of authorship and readership influenced the emplotment of external referents, that is, core facts. It is important to reiterate that core facts are not limited by historicity and include social memories, which may or may not lack historicity, but are accepted as true by authorship and readership. Institutions, laws, and prevailing ideologies shape what White calls a social centre, which determines how core facts are emplotted. Thus, historical narratives are formed around both a community's accepted core facts and its social centre. Finally, Chapter 1 looked at how genre is determined by processes of negotiations between authorship and readership, processes which are not universal or absolute. Therefore, genres of "history" are culturally, temporally, and spatially contingent, and are constantly being negotiated and renegotiated, defined and redefined. What may constitute historical writing in one society or community may not be considered so in another.

Chapter 2 illustrated the central role of divine involvement in the (re)presentation of past events, safeguarding and protecting the social centre of a discourse (and therefore that of a community), and the success and failure of both individuals and society. Divine involvement was viewed to be contingent upon proper moral conduct. The perception that the actions of impious people bring about divine retribution within the context of historical discourse for didactic purposes appears to be an intercultural phenomenon that extended beyond geopolitical borders of the ancient Near East and Mediterranean.

Chapter 3 exhibited how the primary narrative of a text may be interpreted through paradigmatic individuals or embedded texts. Paradigmatic characters also exhibit how to behave or how not to behave toward the discourses' social centre. It is not uncommon for paradigmatic individuals to appear at the beginning of the primary narrative (David and Solomon, Sargon and Naram-Sin, and Solon and Croesus). This being said, paradigmatic characters also may appear at any point in the primary narrative (Ahab and the House of Ahab, the Thirty, and Jason of Pherae). I conjectured that the reason for the apparent randomness of the manifestation of paradigmatic individuals in the primary narratives is due to the limitations in the creation of historical discourse. In other words, core facts precluded the possibility of these paradigms appearing earlier in the discourse. Finally, characters who act as negative paradigms in a given discourse may be deceived by some sort of oracle before their demise—Ahab by false prophets, Croesus by misinterpreting the Delphic oracle, and Xerxes by divinely sent misleading dreams.

Chapter 4 outlined the use of the *topos* of the central city and legitimate cultic place in the formation of historical discourses in the ancient Near East. Chronicles and Babylonian historical narratives, as well as Royal Assyrian Inscriptions, placed a central city and its legitimate cultic place at the core of their respective historical discourses and factored these places into historical causation; that is, those who recognize the status of city and cult and adhere to their principles achieve political success, but those who violate the city and the cult meet with divine retribution. In these historical discourses, both the city and its cult are components of the social centre, and it is a role of the divine to protect and safeguard these aspects of the social centre by punishing those who violate them.

Chapter 5 delineated the role of the restorer of order in ancient Near Eastern historical discourses. In Chronicles, the restorer of order fulfilled the purposes of temple propaganda, which is most evident in 2 Chron. 36:22-23, when the foreign king Cyrus decides to rebuild the Jerusalem temple after he has conquered the region. According to Chronicles, in addition to YHWH being responsible for Cyrus' political and military successes, the Israelite god commanded Cyrus to rebuild the temple. In other ancient Near Eastern texts, namely the Cyrus Cylinder and Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon, the restorer of order was used to legitimize foreign kings as proper kings of Babylon. Finally, it is important to reiterate that narratives that include the restorer of order *topos* tell modern audiences very little about the events surrounding the reigns of both the kings who restore order and the kings who are responsible for the chaos that precedes the restoration of order.

Chapter 6 examined how both immediate and deferred retribution explained disastrous central events in the primary narratives of Chronicles, the *Histories*, and the *Hellenica*. In other words, disaster is caused by both characters during whose time the disaster occurs and their predecessors whose actions contributed to the occurrence of the disastrous event. Once again, this is a case of divine actors safeguarding and maintaining the social centre in each of the three narratives by collectively punishing those who experience the destruction for both their own transgressions and those of their predecessors.

Chapter 7 analyzed and compared the roles of the prophetic figure in Chronicles and the wise advisor in the *Histories*. In both cases, the view of the divine is represented in the speeches of the admonishing figures. Furthermore, admonishing figures present characters with the option of either changing their ways or suffering divine retribution. In both Chronicles and the *Histories*, the headstrong and arrogant ruler is a common audience for admonishing speeches and a frequent target for ensuing retribution when he does not heed the warnings. Finally, the social centre of the narrative comes into play as the ideological components of warning speeches represent the social centre of the discourse, and the divine punishes those who violate the social centre and do not heed the warning to stop.

Intercultural comparisons also reveal important differences between Chronicles and other ancient historiographical texts. For instance, intercultural comparisons may reveal information about some of the central ideologies of a discourse; that is, it becomes evident that similar *topoi* and narrative patterns created unique discourses for specific readerships and communities. In other words, core facts accepted by certain communities were filtered through particular ideological lenses and then imposed upon a common narrative structure to create a unique discourse.

As White has suggested, a community's social centre acts as a catalyst in the composition of historical narratives. Social centres determine how external referents are converted into a narrative, and in the texts surveyed throughout this study, divine actors in the narrative safeguard and protect the text's social centre. In other words, events may be explained by human characters' interaction with the social centre, whether that be an adherence to or a violation of the laws that govern the world of the text, and the divine's reaction, whether reward or punishment, to the human characters' actions. Thus, in the texts surveyed in this study, there is an intimate relationship between divine providence and the social centre of a narrative, since human actions toward the social centre determine how divine actors act and react. Once the social centre of a specific text is identified, it may reveal important insight into the unique socio-historical context of the text, including authorship and readership. As discussed in Chapter 3, paradigmatic characters and embedded texts act as key instruments with which the primary narrative and its social centre may be interpreted. The text's present (i.e., the world of the authorship and readership) is fundamental to its presentation of the past, as the function of historical discourses was to teach receiving audiences. In sum, the narration and emplotment of external referents may reveal a great deal about a text's contemporary world, its institutions, values, and governing laws.

It is evident that ancient Israel, Mesopotamia, and Greece all possessed a genre of historical writing, but the genre was contingent upon what was agreed upon by authorship and readership. In other words, each of the traditions surveyed in this study codified its discourses based on external referents and social memory in a manner unique to its community. Thus, while common *topoi* and narrative structures were used, the discourses were codified differently to conform to the accepted rules agreed upon by a specific authorship and readership. This observation is significant because some scholars still attempt to impose modern genre constructions, or those of certain authors or traditions that most closely resemble modern genre constructions, on ancient discourses and then rank these texts according to this criterion, which often is based on historicity. It is important to acknowledge that we will not find something we call "historical writing" in Mesopotamia by looking for instances of modern or Classical genres of historical discourses. Ancient Israel, Mesopotamia, and Greece all employed common *topoi* and narrative structures in historical discourses but constructed genre differently, since genre is culturally and temporally contingent. Intercultural studies also reveal how a specific tradition, or specific authorship and readership, constructed its genre of historical discourses.

Bibliography

Al-Rawi, F.N.H. "Tablets from the Sippar Library. I. The 'Weidner Chronicle': A Supposititious Royal Letter Concerning a Vision." *Iraq* 52 (1990): 1-14.

Ankersmit, F.R. "Hayden White's Appeal to Historians." *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998): 182-93.

Amit, Yairah. Review of Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel. Review of Biblical Literature* [http://www.bookreviews.org] (2000).

Amit, Yairah. "The Role of Prophecy and Prophets in the Chronicler's World." In Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak (eds.), *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism.* Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. New York: T & T Clark, 2006: 80-101.

Anchor, Robert. "Narrativity and the Transformation of Historical Consciousness." *Clio* 16.2 (1987): 121-37.

Arieti, James A. *Discourses on the First Book of Herodotus.* Lanham, MD: Littlefield Adams Books, 1995.

Bailey, Noel. "David and God in 1 Chronicles 21: Edged with Mist." In M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Textuality.* JSOTSup 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999: 337-59.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2nd edn, 1997.

Barthes, Roland. "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives." In Susana Onega and José Angel García Landa (eds.), *Narratology: An Introduction.* New York: Longman, 1996: 45-59.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Analogical Thinking and Ancient Israelite Intellectual History: The Case for an 'Entropy Model' In the Study of Israelite Thought." In Timothy J. Sandoval and Carleen Mandolfo (eds.), *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible.* JSOTSup 384. London and New York: T & T Clark International, 2003: 321-32.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "The Book of Chronicles: Another Look." 2002 Canadian Society of Biblical Studies Presidential Address. *The Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies* 62 (2002/2003): 5-26.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "A Gateway to the Chronicler's Teaching: The Account of the Reign of Ahaz in 2 Chr 28:1-7." *SJOT* 7.2 (1993): 216-49.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "General Observations on Ancient Israelite Histories in their Ancient Contexts." *Forthcoming.*

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "The House of Omri/Ahab in Chronicles." *Forthcoming.*

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "A House of Treasures: The Account of Amaziah in 2 Chronicles 25—Observations and Implications." *Forthcoming.*

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Malleability and its Limits: Sennacherib's Campaign against Judah as a Case-Study." In Lester L. Grabbe, *'Like a Bird in a Cage: The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE.* JSOTSup 363/ESHM 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003: 73-105.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Observations on Josiah's Account in Chronicles and Implications for Reconstructing the Worldview of the Chronicler." *Forthcoming.*

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "The Secession of the Northern Kingdom in Chronicles: Accepted 'Facts' and New Meanings." In M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie, and Gary N. Knoppers (eds.), *The Chronicler as Theologian.* JSOTSup 371. New York: T&T Clark International, 2003: 61-88.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Theology of the Chronicler." *SJOT* 9.1 (1995): 37-51.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Shifting the Gaze: Historiographic Constraints in Chronicles and Their Implications." In M. Patrick Graham and J. Andrew Dearman (eds.), *The Land that I will Show You: Essays on History and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honour of J. Maxwell Miller.* JSOTSup 343. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001: 38-60.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "When the Foreign Monarch Speaks." In M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Textuality.* JSOTSup 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999: 209-28.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "When YHWH Tests People: General Considerations and Particular Observations Regarding the Books of Chronicles and Job." Paper presented at SBL Pacific Northwest Regional Congress. Spring 2005. Vancouver, British Columbia: 1-13.

Booth, Wayne C. "Types of Narration." In Susana Onega and José Angel García Landa (eds.), *Narratology: An Introduction.* New York: Longman, 1996: 145-54.

Brettler, Marc Zvi. *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel.* New York: Routledge, 1995.

Briant, Pierre. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire.* Trans. Peter T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Brooks, Peter. "Reading for the Plot." In Susana Onega and José Angel García Landa (eds.), *Narratology: An Introduction.* New York: Longman, 1996: 251-61.

Cairns, Douglas L. "*Hybris*, Dishonour, and Thinking Big." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116 (1996): 1-32.

Carter, Charles E. *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study.* JSOTSup 294. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Chiasson, Charles C. "Herodotus' Use of Attic Tragedy in the Lydian *Logos*." *Classical Antiquity* 22.1 (2003): 5-35.

Cogan, Mordechai. "Cyrus Cylinder (2.124)." In William W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World.* 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003: II, 314-16.

Cogan, Mordechai. "Sennacherib: The Capture and Destruction of Babylon (2.119E)." In William W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World.* 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003: II, 305.

Cogan, Mordechai. "Omens and Ideology in the Babylon Inscription of Esarhaddon." In H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld (eds.), *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Cuneiform Literatures.* Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1983: 76-87.

Cooper, Jerrold S. *The Curse of Agade.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Cooper, Jerrold S. "Paradigm and Propaganda: The Dynasty of Akkade in the 21st Century." In Mario Liverani (ed.), *Akkad, The First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions.* HANE/S V. Sargon, 1993: 11-23.

Dandamayev, M.A. "Achaemenid Imperial Policies and Provincial Governments." *Iranica Antiqua* 34 (1999): 269-82.

Desmond, William. "Punishments and the Conclusion of Herodotus' *Histories*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 44.1 (2004): 19-40.

Dewald, Carolyn. "Explanatory Notes." *The Histories.* Trans. Robin Waterfield. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Dewald, Carolyn. "Introduction." *Herodotus. The Histories.* Trans. Robin Waterfield. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Dillard, Raymond. *2 Chronicles*. Waco, TX: Word Books, Publisher, 1987.

Dillery, John. *Xenophon and the History of His Times*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Dover, K.J. *Greek Popular Morality: In the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Indianapolis: Hacket Publishing Company, Inc., 1994.

Duke, Rodney K. "A Rhetorical Approach to Appreciating the Books of Chronicles." In M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Textuality*. JSOTSup 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999: 100-35.

Dyck, Jonathan E. *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler*. Biblical Interpretation Series 33. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Evans, J.A.S. "The Imperialist Impulse." In *Herodotus the Explorer: Three Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991: 9-40.

Evans, J.A.S. "Individuals in Herodotus." In *Herodotus the Explorer: Three Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991: 41-88.

Ferguson, Arthur B. "The Historical Thought of Samuel Daniel: A Study in Renaissance Ambivalence." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32 (1971): 185-202.

Finkelstein, J.J. "Mesopotamian Historiography." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 107.6 (1963): 461-72.

Finkelstein, J.J. "The So-Called 'Old Babylonian Kutha Legend'." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 11 (1957): 83-88.

Flower Michael A. and John Marincola (eds.). *Herodotus Histories: Book IX*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Fornara, Charles W. *Herodotus: An Interpretive Essay*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Fornara, Charles W. *The Nature of History in Greece and Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Foster, Benjamin R. "Prayer to Marduk (1.14)." In William W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Inscriptions from the Biblical World*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003: I, 416-17.

Foucault, Michel. *Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" In James D. Faubion (ed.), *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. Trans. Robert Hurley and others. Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. vol. 2. New York: The New York Press, 1998: 205-22.

Glassner, Jean-Jacques. *Mesopotamian Chronicles.* Ed. Benjamin R. Foster. Writings from the Ancient World 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

Gould, John. "Herodotus and Religion." In Simon Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994: 91-106.

Gray, Vivienne. *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Grayson, A.K. "Assyria and Babylonia." *Orientalia* 49 (1980): 140-94.

Grayson, A.K. *Assyrian and Babylonia Chronicles*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Grayson, A.K. *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts.* Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Gurney, O.R. "The Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin." *Anatolian Studies* 5 (1955): 93-113.

Hall, Edith. Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Hallo, William W. "Esarhaddon (2.120)." In William W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World.* 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003: II, 306.

Halpern, Baruch. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History.* San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

Harrison, Thomas. *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Harrison, Thomas. "Herodotus and the Certainty of Divine Retribution." In Alan B. Lloyd (ed.), *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity.* London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1997.

Hart, John. *Herodotus and Greek History.* London: Croom Helm Ltd, 1982.

Hartog, Francois. "The Invention of History: The Pre-History of a Concept from Homer to Herodotus." *History and Theory* 39 (October 2000): 384-95.

Herodotus. *The Histories.* Trans. Robin Waterfield. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Hoglund, Kenneth G. "The Chronicler as Historian: A Comparativist Perspective." In M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie (eds.), *Chronicler as Historian.* JSOTSup 238. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997: 19-29.

Huizinga, Johan. "A Definition of the Concept of History." In Raymond Klibansky and H.J. Patton (eds.), *Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963: 1-10

Immerwahr, Henry R. *Form and Thought in Herodotus.* Philological Monographs 23. Cleveland, OH: Press of Western Reserve University, 1966.

Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.

Japhet, Sara. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in the Biblical Thought.* BEATAJ 9. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997.

Japhet, Sara. "Periodization between History and Ideology II: Chronology and Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah." In Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and Judeans in the Persian Period.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006: 491-508.

Johnstone, William. *1 and 2 Chronicles: 2 Chronicles 10-36 Guilt and Atonement*. 2 vols. JSOTSup 254. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Kalimi, Isaac. *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place and Writing*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 46. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 2005.

Kalimi, Isaac. "Literary-Chronological Proximity in the Chronicler's Historiography." *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (1993): 318-38.

Kalimi, Isaac. *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Kalimi, Isaac. "Was the Chronicler a Historian?" In M .Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie (eds.), *Chronicler as Historian.* JSOTSup 238. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997: 73-89.

Kansteiner, Wulf. "Hayden White's Critique of the Writing of History." *History and Theory* 32.3 (1993): 273-95.

Kelly, Brian E. *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Kelly, Brian E. "'Retribution' Revisited: Covenant, Grace and Restoration." In M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie, and Gary N. Knoppers (eds.), *The*

Chronicler as Theologian. JSOTSup 371. New York: T&T Clark International, 2003: 206-27.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Greek Historiography and the Chronicler's History: A Reexamination." *JBL* 122.4 (2003): 627-50.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Zion: A Study in the Early History of Samaritans and Jews." *Studies in Religion* 34.3/4 (2005): 309-38.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109.3 (1990): 423-40.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Revisiting the Samarian Question in the Persian Period." In Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and Judeans in the Persian Period.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006: 265-89.

Kuhrt, Amélie. *The Ancient Near East: 3000-330 BC.* 2 vols. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Kuhrt, Amélie. "The Cyrus Cylinder and Achaemenid Imperial Policy." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 25 (1983): 83-97.

Kuhrt, Amélie. "Israelite and Near Eastern Historiography." In An Lemaire and M. Sæbø. (eds.), *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 80. Brill, 1998: 257-79.

Kuhrt, Amélie. "Nabodinus and the Babylonian Priesthood." In Mary Beard and John North (eds.), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990: 119-55.

Lambert, W.G. "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion." In W.S. McCullough ed., *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964: 3-11.

Lateiner, Donald. *The Historical Method of Herodotus.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Lateiner, Donald. "Review Article: Assessing the Nature of Herodotus' Mind and Text." *Classical Philology* 97.4 (2002): 371-382.

Lattimore, Richmond. "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus." *Classical Philology* 34 (1939): 24-35.

Lemaire, André. "New Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea and Their Historical Interpretation." In Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and Judeans in the Persian Period.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006: 413-56.

Liverani, Mario. "Akkad: An Introduction." In Mario Liverani (ed.), *Akkad, The First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions.* HANE/S V. Sargon, 1993: 1-10.

Liverani, Mario. "The Deeds of Ancient Mesopotamian Kings." In Jack Sasson (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East.* 4 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2000: IV, 2353-66.

Liverani, Mario. "Kitru, kataru." *Mesopotamia* 17 (1982): 43-66.

Liverani, Mario. "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts." *Orientalia* 42 (1973): 178-94.

Liverani, Mario. "Model and Actualization: The Kings of Akkad in the Historical Tradition." In Mario Liverani (ed.), *Akkad, The First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions.* HANE/S V. Sargon, 1993: 41-67.

Longman III, Tremper. *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography: A Generic and Comparative Study.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1991.

Mason, Rex. *Preaching the Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

McKenzie, Steven L. *1-2 Chronicles.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004.

Mikalson, Jon D. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Mink, Louis O. "History and Fiction as Modes of Comprehension." *New Literary History* 1.3 (1970): 541-58.

Moles, John. "Herodotus and Athens." In E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus.* Leiden: Brill, 2002: 33-52.

Momgliano, Arnaldo. "Elements in Jewish, and Greek, Historiography." *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography.* Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1977: 25-35.

Monkkonen, Eric H. "The Challenge of Quantitative History." *Historical Methods* 17.3 (1984): 86-94.

Murphy, Tim. "Discourse." In Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon (eds.), *Guide to the Study of Religion.* London and New York: Cassell, 2000: 396-408.

Myers, Eric M. "Jewish Culture in Greco-Roman Palestine." in David Biale (ed.), *Cultures of the Jews: A New History.* New York: Schocken Books, 2002: 135-79.

Myers, Jacob M. *II Chronicles.* AB 13; New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Oded, Bustenay. *War, Peace and Empire: Justifications for War in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions.* Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1992.

Osborne, Robin. *Greece in the Making: 1200-479 BC.* New York: Routledge, 1996.

Partner, Nancy. "Hayden White: The Form of the Content." *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998): 162-72.

Pelling, C.B.R. "Thucydides' Archidamus and Herodotus' Artabanus." In Michael A. Flower and Mark Toher (eds.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell.* London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1991: 120-42.

Peltonen, Kai. "A Jigsaw without a Model? The Date of Chronicles." In Lester L. Grabbe (ed.), *Did Moses Speak Attic: Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period.* JSOTSup 317/ESHM 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001: 225-71.

Pocock, J.G.A. "The Origins of the Study of the Past." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 4 (1961–1962): 209-46.

Porter, Barbara Nevling. *Images, Power, and Politics: Figurative Aspects of Esarhaddon's Babylonian Policy.* Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 208. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1993.

Pownall, Frances Skoczylas. "Condemantion of the Impious in Xenophon's *Hellenica.*" *Harvard Theological Journal* 91.3 (1998): 251-77.

Pownall, Frances. *Lessons From the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Prince, Gerald. "Introduction to the Study of the Narratee." In Susana Onega and José Angel García Landa (eds.), *Narratology: An Introduction.* New York: Longman, 1996: 190-201.

Pritchard, James B. (ed.). *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2nd edn, 1955.

Raaflaub, Kurt A. "Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of His Time." In E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill, 2002: 149-86.

Redfield, James. "Herodotus the Tourist." *Classical Philology* 80 (1985): 97-118.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative.* 2 vols. Trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Rood, Tim. "Thucydides' Persian Wars." In Christina Shuttleworth Kraus (ed.), *Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts.* Leiden: Brill, 1999: 141-68.

Roth, Martha T. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor.* Ed. Piotr Michalowski. Writings from the Ancient World 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2nd edn, 1997.

Rüsen, Jörn. "Some Theoretical Approaches to Intercultural Comparative Historiography." *History and Theory* 35.4. Theme Issue 35: Chinese Historiography in Comparative Perspective (1996): 5-22.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 2003.

Schniedewind, William. *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period.* JSOTSup 197. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Shipley, Graham. *The Greek World After Alexander: 323-30 BC.* New York: Routledge, 2001.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Speiser, E.A. "Ancient Mesopotamia." In Robert C. Dentan (ed.), *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955: 37-76.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Throntveit, Mark A. "The Idealization of Solomon as the Glorification of God in the Chronicler's Royal Speeches and Royal Prayers." In Lowell K. Handy (ed.), *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium.* Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 11. Leiden: Brill, 1997: 411-27.

Throntveit, Mark A. "The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Books of Chronicles." In M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie, and Gary N. Knoppers (eds.), *The Chronicler as Theologian.* JSOTSup 371. New York: T&T Clark International, 2003: 105-21.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *Genres in Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Tuplin, Christopher. *The Failings of Empire: A Reading of Xenophon Hellenica.* Historia Einzelschriften 76. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993.

Urton, Gary. "From Knots to Narrative: Reconstructing the Art of Historical Record Keeping in the Andes from Spanish Transcriptions of Inka *Khipus*." *Ethnohistory* 45.3 (1998): 410-38.

Van Seters, John. "The Historiography of the Ancient Near East." In Jack Sasson (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East.* 4 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2000: IV, 2433-44.

Van Seters, John. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.

Vann, Richard T. "The Reception of Hayden White." *History and Theory* 37.2 (1998): 143-61.

Veyne, Paul. *Writing History: Essay on Epistemology*. Trans. Mina Moore-Rinuolucri. Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1971.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions* (Volume 1). 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962.

Weitzman, Steven. "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution." *JBL* 123.2 (2004): 219-34.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.

Westenholz, Joan Goodnick. *Legends of the Kings of Akkade.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.

White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." In *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978: 81-100.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." *Critical Inquiry* 7.1 (1980): 5-27.

Woolf, Daniel R. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart: Erudition, Ideology, and "Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Woolf, Daniel. "Of Nations, Nationalism, and National Identity: Reflections on the Historiographic Organization of the Past." *Forthcoming.*

Zagorin, Perez. "History, the Referent, and Narrative: Reflections on Postmodernism Now." *History and Theory* 38.1 (1999): 1-24.

Xenophon, *The Education of Cyrus*. Trans. Wayne Ambler. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Xenophon. *A History of My Times (Hellenica).* Trans. Rex Warner. Toronto: Penguin Books Canada Ltd, 1979.

Xenophon. *Memorabalia.* Trans. E.C. Marchant. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1938.